S. HRG. 100-476

CHILD CARE

HEARING

BEFORE THE

SUBCOMMITTEE ON CHILDREN, FAMILY, DRUGS AND ALCOHOLISM

OF THE

COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND HUMAN RESOURCES UNITED STATES SENATE

ONE HUNDREDTH CONGRESS

FIRST SESSION

ON

EXAMINING INITIATIVES NEEDED TO MEET THE DEMAND FOR QUALITY AND AFFORDABLE CHILD CARE IN THE UNITED STATES

JUNE 11, 1987

Printed for the use of the Committee on Labor and Human Resources

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

81-972 WASHINGTON : 1988

For sale by the Superintendent of Documents, Congressional Sales Office
U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, DC 20402

S541-28

COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND HUMAN RESOURCES

EDWARD M. KENNEDY, Massachusetts, *Chairman*

CLAIBORNE PELL, Rhode Island
HOWARD M. METZENBAUM, Ohio
SPARK M. MATSUNAGA, Hawaii
CHRISTOPHER J. DODD, Connecticut
PAUL SIMON, Illinois
TOM HARKIN, Iowa
BROCK ADAMS, Washington
BARBARA A. MIKULSKI, Maryland

ORRIN G. HATCH, Utah
ROBERT T. STAFFORD, Vermont
DAN QUAYLE, Indiana
STROM THURMOND, South Carolina
LOWELL P. WEICKER, JR., Connecticut
THAD COCHRAN, Mississippi
GORDON J. HUMPHREY, New Hampshire

THOMAS M. ROLLINS, *Staff Director and Chief Counsel*
HAYDEN G. BRYAN, *Minority Staff Director*

SUBCOMMITTEE ON CHILDREN, FAMILY, DRUGS AND ALCOHOLISM

CHRISTOPHER J. DODD, Connecticut, *Chairman*

CLAIBORNE PELL, Rhode Island
TOM HARKIN, Iowa
BROCK ADAMS, Washington
EDWARD M. KENNEDY, Massachusetts
(Ex Officio)

STROM THURMOND, South Carolina
THAD COCHRAN, Mississippi
ORRIN G. HATCH, Utah

MARSHA E. RENWANZ, *Staff Director*
J. KERSHAW SPONG, *Minority Council*

CONTENTS

STATEMENTS

THURSDAY, JUNE 11, 1987

	Page
Fege, Arnold, director, Office of Governmental Relations, National PTA, Washington, DC; Douglas Baird, Chair, Day Care Task Force, Child Welfare League of America, Inc., and executive director, Associated Day Care Services of Metropolitan Boston, Boston, MA; Helen Blank, director of child care, Children's Defense Fund, Washington, DC; and Wendy R. Sherman, special secretary for children and youth, State of Maryland, Baltimore, MD	91
Prepared statements of:	
Mr. Fege	96
Mr. Baird	111
Ms. Blank	124
Ms. Sherman	144
Harkin, Hon. Tom, a U.S. Senator from the State of Iowa, prepared statement	8
Metzenbaum, Hon. Howard M., a U.S. Senator from the State of Ohio, prepared statement	6
Preston, Marva, detective, city of Miami Police Department, Miami, FL; Judy Griesse, family day care provider, Fairfax County, VA; Alyce Chessone, family day care provider, Fairfax County, VA; and Gary Goldberg, executive producer of "Family Ties," UBU Productions, Los Angeles, CA	11
Prepared statement of Ms. Preston	13
Zigler, Edward, director, Yale Bush Center in Child Development and Social Policy, New Haven, CT; Toni Porter, director of research and program development, Child Care Inc., New York, NY; Nancy Travis, director, southern States office, Save the Children, Atlanta, GA; and Caro Pemberton, Child Care Employee Project, Oakland, CA	33
Prepared statements of:	
Mr. Zigler	36
Ms. Porter	44
Ms. Travis	61
Ms. Pemberton	73

CHILD CARE

THURSDAY, JUNE 11, 1987

U.S. SENATE,
SUBCOMMITTEE ON CHILDREN, FAMILY,
DRUGS AND ALCOHOLISM,
COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND HUMAN RESOURCES,
Washington, DC.

The subcommittee met, pursuant to notice, at 9:39 a.m., in room SD-430, Dirksen Senate Office Building, Senator Christopher J. Dodd (chairman of the subcommittee) presiding.

Present: Senators Dodd, Mikulski, Hatch, and Pell.

OPENING STATEMENT OF SENATOR DODD

Senator DODD. The Subcommittee on Children, Family, Drugs and Alcoholism will come to order.

I am delighted to call to order today's hearing on child care. Child care happens to be the very first topic addressed by the Senate Children's Caucus which Senator Arlen Specter and I set up in 1983.

At that hearing more than 4 years ago, we learned that somewhere between 5 and 15 million elementary school children are latchkey children. They lack adult supervision after school because their parents, must work. That estimate did not include the millions of pre-school-age children with parents in the labor force who need child care services.

Since that first hearing 4 years ago, we have continued to see a skyrocketing demand for quality, affordable child care in this country. Thirty years ago, men made up 70 percent of the work force. Today, close to 70 percent of all mothers with school-age children work outside the home, so do close to half of all mothers with infants under the age of 1 year old. By 1995 80 percent of all women of child-bearing age will be in the work force.

The reasons behind this demographic revolution are clear enough. Mothers are entering the work force out of economic necessity. Two-thirds of all women working outside the home today are either the sole providers for their children or have husbands who are earning less than $15,000 a year.

Although these women's wages are critical to the support of their families, they are often not enough to pay for quality child care. In 1983, the average earnings of a female worker was only $12,758. A family of four living on that salary is, by definition, living in poverty.

Administration-sponsored cuts in the Title XX social services block grant program have meant that in 23 States fewer children

were in public supported child care in 1986 than in 1981. Thus, as demand has increased, federal assistance has decreased. We certainly seem to be moving in the wrong direction.

In my own State of Connecticut, two out of every three low-income children receive no child care assistance at all, and half of all the towns in my home State lack any after-school program whatsoever.

As we will hear this morning from our distinguished witnesses, the demand for quality, affordable child care is not going to disappear. Everyone, from the federal, state, and local government to the private sector, parents and child care providers, has a significant role to play.

We have managed to put several small child care initiatives into place over the past several years. Those include training scholarships which I sponsored for low-income child care workers. And, my distinguished colleague from Maryland spearheaded the move to provide seed money for resource and referral agencies in after-school programs. Nevertheless, we have a long way to go, indeed, in addressing the critical issue of child care in this country.

This morning, we will hear about the importance of quality. In the absence of any federal standards, some States license caregivers with a staff ratio of about one adult to seven infants. Yet, common sense should tell us that one adult could never rescue, for instance, seven children from a building that has caught on fire.

Likewise, we will hear about the relationship between the low salaries of child care workers and high staff turnover, directly diminishing the quality of care for young children.

In addition to addressing the issue of salaries, another sure way to improve the quality of child care in this country is to improve the skills and performance of child care workers.

I look forward to hearing the comments of our witnesses this morning on the Family Day Care Provider Assistance Act, a bill which I introduced to provide training and technical assistance for such providers.

Even by conservative estimates, family day care providers care for 70 percent of all the children of working parents under child care. Yet, despite the fact that they care for the vast majority of the children whose parents work outside the home, few receive any training or support. And, 90 percent of all family day care providers earn less than the minimum wage.

Of special interest to many of us has been the role of the private sector with respect to child care. This morning's hearing will include a look at the innovative on-site child care center at Paramount Studios in Los Angeles and corporate contributions toward resource and referral systems in the South and Northeast.

As much as those of us facing the tough decisions posed by the federal deficit might like to see the role of business increased with respect to child care, it should not be overestimated. Of the 6 million employers in this country, only 2,000 to 3,000 provide any child care assistance whatsoever to their employees.

For those who see employer assistance with child care as a substitute for parental leave, it is important to remember that unless a parent's job is protected, neither he nor she will have any pressing need for child care.

In addition to hearing from parents, providers and professionals, we will hear from a range of organizations this morning that support a stronger federal relationship in the issue of child care. We will also hear the State perspective on the role of government at all levels with respect to the care of our most valuable resource: our nation's children.

Before I call on our first panel of witnesses, let me ask my colleague from Utah, who is kind enough to be here this morning, if he has an opening statement or any comments he would like to make I will then turn to my colleague from Maryland and then we will get into our first panel.

OPENING STATEMENT OF SENATOR HATCH

Senator HATCH. Well, thank you so much, Mr. Chairman. I want to commend you for convening this hearing here today on the topic of child care.

As one who has been trying to fashion legislation to address the child care issue, I really can appreciate the complexities of this problem. They are very difficult, and I have to admit it is a very, very difficult thing to get done.

I suspect that it is going to take some leadership from someone like myself and others who perhaps are considered more moderate to conservative in order to get a child care bill through and for the bill to have the support it will need in the Congress of the United States.

The first issue is access to child care for families in need—if we want to encourage independence from government assistance programs, we have to provide the means for low-income families to obtain adequate child care.

It is simply not fair to assume that low-income families love their children any less and that they do not want the best for them and for their children. We must also evaluate the success of current efforts in this area in meeting the needs of these families.

Second, there is the issue of availability of child care for all families, and the issue of choice. Not every family wants the same kind of child care. While most prefer in-home care, others opt for commercial day care, church or non-profit centers, or on-site care offered by the employer. I think we have to look at ways of expanding available options for all families.

Third, there is the issue of quality, and the Chairman has rightly raised this issue. Everyone wants their child in a clean, safe and wholesome environment. Such an atmosphere can exist with child care providers large or small, but the question remains, what is the government's role in ensuring the quality of child care.

In our haste to protect children and their families from hazards and abuses, we also do not want to step over the line of interference and overregulation or ignore the importance of parental involvement.

The last thing on earth I want, Mr. Chairman, and I think anyone who thinks about it wants, is a great big federal involvement in child care through bureaucratic over-regulation, increasing the costs of it, and winding up with the taxpayers paying for every aspect of child care.

It seems to me that the best way to have child care would be to have some incentives from the federal government, but also to encourage people in the private sector, especially in the charitable sector, in the religious sector, to do everything that they possibly can in this area.

But we have to have some incentives, and I understand that, and I am very anxious to learn about the various model programs which are working so well throughout our country. In Utah, for example, the Utah Junior League operates the "Child Care Connection", which helps to identify child care providers who meet the criteria requested by the parents. This successful resource and referral program has stimulated the availability of child care in Utah. I think a lot more than that has to be done, but I really give them credit for grabbing the ball and going out and doing that.

Programs such as that demonstrate not only the ingenuity of communities and organizations in addressing these issues, but also their resolve to do so.

Now, I think this is one of the most important issues in America at this time. I think it is time for the conservatives to wake up and realize that if they are pro-family and they want to see families grow and progress and develop, and they want kids to have the right opportunities to grow, progress, develop, and to learn, then, by gosh, they have got to do something about this horrendous problem.

I think we are going to have to have more conservative leadership on this if we are going to resolve the problem before it is over. Now, I intend to provide that if I can. I intend to cooperate with the Chairman.

I sure have a lot of respect for Senator Mikulski as well. I have learned to really appreciate her here in the Senate. I have a lot of regard for her.

I want to work with them, but I also think we have got to really think it through. We just cannot have another great big, costly program of the federal government to resolve these problems. I am not against having federal government support, but I think we really have to do it the proper way that will maximize getting the private sector and non-profit and charitable organizations involved to the highest degree, and parents.

I think if we can do that, we will solve this problem. If it is just another big federal program, you do not have enough money in the federal government to solve this problem under present circumstances, nor will you, even if we can ever overcome some of these huge deficits.

But I am willing to risk something here and I am willing to do whatever can be done. I hope to that extent I will be helpful in this process.

Mr. Chairman, I just plain want to thank you for this hearing. I cannot stay, but I will read what is said here today. I will try and learn from it and I will have my staff work on it very, very hard, which they are doing, and hopefully we can come up with a bill that all of us are very proud of.

Thank you very much.

Senator DODD. Before you leave, I should say to those who are here this morning, occasionally people show up and become interested because there is a hearing going on.

But everyone in this room ought to know that Senator Hatch, despite what differences we may have had on other issues along the way, is not a johnny-come-lately on this one.

Your support on the after-school resource and referral programs was crucial, and I can go back and cite a number of other cases where we have been involved in issues involving children; the Baby Jane Doe case, for instance, going back a number of years ago.

So your leadership will be extremely important to us. It would be wrong if you were to leave here assuming, I guess, that what I am talking about is a massive federal program.

Senator HATCH. No, I do not take it that way. I just want to make sure we do not——

Senator DODD. We are looking at quality and availability and affordability of these programs, and we look forward to having your assistance. You have already been there, and we want to keep you along on these things. So, we thank you.

Senator HATCH. Well, thank you. That makes me feel very good, and I likewise acknowledge your efforts and Senator Mikulski's efforts in this regard and in all of these areas. I am really happy to see you as chairman of this particular Subcommittee. I think you have a lot of feeling for families and what needs to be done here.

Senator DODD. Thank you.

Senator HATCH. And I know that my friend from Maryland does.

Senator DODD. Absolutely.

Senator Mikulski.

OPENING STATEMENT OF SENATOR MIKULSKI

Senator MIKULSKI. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and thank you for the opportunity to participate in today's hearing.

Child care is an issue that I have worked on for a long time, and I frequently talk about the importance of helping people solve the problems they face in their day-to-day lives, seeking sensible solutions to concrete problems.

Child care is now, and has been for many years, a serious problem that cuts across all social and economic lines. As a Congresswoman, I sponsored the Child Care Information and Referral Act passed in 1984 as part of the human service amendments.

This program authorized funding for new or improving child care information and referral clearinghouses, essentially one-stop shops in communities that enabled parents to locate day care for their children. It is identical to the program outlined by Senator Hatch which occurs in Utah.

In my own State of Maryland, we have a program called LOCATE, which helps people identify licensed day care. Unfortunately, this program has never been adequately funded. My concern today, however, is that safe, competent child care can be made available.

It is very difficult to find, expensive to pay for, and parents often have to rely on word of mouth to find out who provides child care

in their community, what hours are available, and whether or not the provider is qualified.

The mom or dad who is wondering whether Susie is warm and safe may not be able to focus on the car they are helping to build or the report they are trying to write. Moms and dads are even less likely to be able to increase their earnings through higher-paying jobs or seek training as long as we do not have the support systems available.

The issues are very straightforward for all parents and those of us who are concerned about the American family. The issues are availability, affordability, and also making sure that the providers have services that are safe and competent.

I am particularly concerned and interested in partnerships between the federal government and the private sector on the issue of child care. Day care is both a family issue and an issue of productivity. Both sectors have the same interest, a productive worker.

I find it difficult to understand how we can provide parking lot spaces for businesses and not ensure day care slots for children. Surely, if the private sector is enlightened enough to provide a spot to park your car, they could at the same time think of how we can come up with creative and innovative solutions on where we can care for children during business hours.

The need for child care in this country has been well documented and I know that we will hear more. The parents' ability to be productive is also related to this. If we are talking about a successful welfare reform effort, we must also make sure we have day care.

Whether you are working on your MBA or whether you are trying to pull yourself out of a welfare situation, we need to be sure that we provide day care or dependent care. It is a national issue and I believe it is an issue of not only national importance, but I truly believe we are reaching a crisis point.

I look forward to working on a bipartisan basis, as I said, to seek sensible solutions to this very concrete problem.

Senator DODD. Thank you, Senator Mikulski.

I would also note that Senator Metzenbaum, while he is not a member of the subcommittee, has a deep interest in the issue of child care, and has asked that a prepared statement of his be included in the record. He had to be in Ohio this morning at 10 o'clock and cannot be with us, so I ask unanimous consent that a statement of his be included in the record.

We will also include in the record at this point a statement by Senator Harkin.

[The prepared statements of Senators Metzenbaum and Harkin follow:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF SENATOR METZENBAUM

Senator METZENBAUM. Mr. Chairman, I would like to thank you for the opportunity to participate in today's hearing.

Your leadership on children's issues has been instrumental in the past, and I am certain that we share a deep concern about the issue of day care and the failure of the Federal Government to support this very critical need of America's families.

We've got a challenge on our hands. The American labor force has been transformed over the past two decades, and the Federal Government has been asleep at the switch.

In America today: 51 percent of mothers with children under 3 are in the labor force;

In 65 percent of married-couple families with children, both the husband and wife work;

By 1990, two-thirds of all new workers will be women, most of them will become mothers at some point during their working lives.

Women work for the same reasons that men do. To put food on the table and a roof overhead.

It often takes two incomes to make it in America today. That's the reality—and here is the problem. The supply of quality, affordable day care has not kept pace with the changing America family.

The majority of working parents report difficulty in finding the kind of child care they need at a price they can afford.

The result is long waiting lists, complex arrangements with family members and baby-sitters, and a lot of anxiety.

There is nothing more important to a parent than knowing their child is being cared for in a safe and loving environment. If you don't have that, you don't have peace-of-mind.

America needs quality day care and what we've got is a shortage—a shortage of crisis proportions for infants, for handicapped children and for kids after-school.

For too long, day care has been placed at the bottom of the national agenda. Now day care must become a national priority. For this reason, in the U.S. Senate on Wednesday, May 21, I introduced the Day Care for Working Families Act of 1987.

The bill will provide special, guaranteed loans for the construction of day care centers. It will establish employer-community day care councils to provide resource and referral services for employees; grants for the expansion of day care facilities; and support for day care for handicapped children.

The legislation will also provide financial aid for low-income families. One dollar invested in day care saves $3 in welfare. It's time we made that investment.

Finally the legislation takes basic standards for day care which were passed in the Ohio legislature and applies them nationwide.

But to move this kind of legislation in the Senate we need help—we need grass-roots testimony on the importance of day care in people's working lives. That's why I carried a hearing on day care of the Senate Labor Subcommittee in Toledo on May 22. The hearing provided invaluable testimony from parents, day care providers, and experts in the field. Today, your committee, Mr. Chairman, will also receive excellent testimony on the need for day care in this country.

Seven years ago, when I passed legislation expanding the day care tax credit, I spoke in the congressional record about how far behind we had fallen in meeting our need for day care.

Together, we can make sure that 7 years from now we are singing a different tune—about how we came to grips with this critical national issue and provided safe, adequate, and affordable care for our children.

STATEMENT BY SENATOR TOM HARKIN

HEARING ON CHILDCARE

THURSDAY, JUNE 11, 1987

I WOULD LIKE TO TAKE JUST A MOMENT TO COMMEND THE DISTINGUISHED CHAIRMAN OF THIS SUBCOMMITTEE FOR CALLING THIS HEARING ON SUCH AN IMPORTANT MATTER. CHRIS DODD HAS BEEN A TIRELESS ADVOCATE FOR CHILDREN AND FAMILIES, AND HIS ATTENTION TODAY TO THE ISSUE OF CHILDCARE IS JUST ONE MORE DEMONSTRATION OF HIS DEVOTION TO THEIR CAUSE. THANK YOU, MR. CHAIRMAN, FOR CALLING THIS HEARING.

I WANT TO SAY JUST A FEW WORDS ABOUT HOW VERY IMPORTANT I BELIEVE THIS ISSUE REALLY IS. THE AVAILABLITY OF CHILDCARE HAS A PROFOUND AFFECT ON THE OVERALL WELLBEING OF OUR FAMILIES -- THAT MUCH I THINK IS CLEAR. WITHOUT IT, OUR YOUNG CHILDREN ARE LEFT UNATTENDED, AND YOUNG PARENTS ARE LEFT WITH NO OPTIONS FOR EMPLOYMENT. ONE AND ONE-HALF MILLION PRESCHOOL CHILDREN IN THIS COUNTRY ARE LEFT UNATTENDED AT LEAST PART OF THE DAY WHILE THEIR PARENTS ARE WORKING. AND IN A RECENT SURVEY, 25 PERCENT OF NON-WORKING PARENTS SAID THAT THEY WOULD WORK IF CARE WAS AVAILABLE FOR THEIR FAMILIES.

THE NUMBER OF CHILDREN REQUIRING DAY CARE WILL CONTINUE TO GROW. BY 1990 A PROJECTED 10.4 MILLION CHILDREN UNDER THE AGE OF SIX AND 19.6 MILLION SCHOOL AGE CHILDREN FIVE TO THIRTEEN WILL HAVE A WORKING MOTHER. I THINK THAT WE'VE CLEARLY ESTABLISHED THE NEED FOR A NATIONAL SYSTEM OF QUALITY DAY CARE -- SOMETHING OTHER THAN THE PIECEMEAL APPROACH WE HAVE TAKEN IN THE PAST.

AS THE SUBCOMMITTEE WORKS ON DRAFTING CHILDCARE LEGISLATION, I HOPE THAT MEMBERS WILL KEEP IN MIND THE SPECIAL NEEDS OF CHILDREN WITH HANDICAPPS. THE PROBLEMS MOST PARENTS FACE IN OBTAINING AFFORDABLE QUALITY CHILDCARE ARE COMPOUNDED FOR THE PARENTS OF CHILDREN WITH DISABILITIES WHO WANT TO SEE THEIR CHILDREN CARED FOR IN AN INTEGRATED ENVIRONMENT.

I AM CONFIDENT THAT THE SUBCOMMITTEE CAN WORK OUT A CHILDCARE PROPOSAL AND LOOK FORWARD TO WORKING WITH THE CHAIRMAN TOWARD THAT END. THE ISSUE OF CHILDCARE WILL WITHOUT QUESTION BE OF PARAMOUNT IMPORTANCE TO AMERICA'S FUTURE ECONOMIC SECURITY, AND DESERVES, I BELIEVE, THE IMMEDIATE ATTENTION OF THE SENATE.

Senator DODD. I am going to call our first panel of witnesses and as they approach the witness table, I will tell you a little bit about them. If I mispronounce any names, correct me when you arrive at the microphones.

They are Marva Preston, who is a detective with the City of Miami Police Department; Judy Griesse and Alyce Chessnoe, who are family day care providers in Fairfax County, Virginia; and Gary Goldberg, the executive producer of "Family Ties."

Marva Preston, as I mentioned, is a detective with the Miami Police Department. She has spent 10 years on the Miami police force. She has spent 6 years on the homicide detail, and they are very busy there—and I might add, that is unfortunate given the nature of their work, as I am sure you would agree, Marva. Although the Department is so busy, Marva's lieutenant felt this issue was of such importance that she ought to be here today.

I also understand you have an engagement this evening in Florida—the high school commencement of your daughter—and so we are going to make sure you catch a plane and be home for that. We do not want you to miss that at all.

Did I pronounce it correctly, Judy Griesse?

Ms. GRIESSE. That is correct.

Senator DODD. That is correct, and Alyce——

Ms. CHESSNOE. Chessnoe.

Senator DODD. Chessnoe; I did pretty well, all right.

Both Judy and Alyce will tell us of their hands-on experience as family day care providers. Judy Griesse has spent 9 years as a family day care provider. Previous to that, she was an elementary school teacher for 15 years.

Alyce has spent 11 years as a family day care provider, and prior to that she was a teacher for 10 years. She has also served, as the President of the Northern Virginia Family Day Care Association.

We are delighted that both of you could be with us this morning. I have followed the Washington Post story about babysitters, which I am sure you are going to refer to here this morning.

Gary Goldberg, we welcome you. You have come all the way from California. We appreciate it. Gary is the creator and executive producer of the second most watched program in the history of television, "Family Ties." He is also the founder of the newly-established child care center at Paramount Studios which was featured in the New York Times last Saturday.

He is the father of a 14-year-old and a 3-year-old, which is an important credential in these discussions. You come here not only as a provider, and a parent, but also as someone who will tell us about his longstanding interest in this issue. And I understand that interest goes back to the days when you were not producing top-run television shows but were thinking about it.

Marva, we will begin with you. Again, we thank all of you for coming here this morning. Any prepared statements you have will be included in the record as if read in full. If you want to paraphrase them or just talk extemporaneously, that is fine.

Marva.

STATEMENTS OF MARVA PRESTON, DETECTIVE, CITY OF MIAMI POLICE DEPARTMENT, MIAMI, FL; JUDY GRIESSE, FAMILY DAY CARE PROVIDER, FAIRFAX COUNTY, VA; ALYCE CHESSNOE, FAMILY DAY CARE PROVIDER, FAIRFAX COUNTY, VA; AND GARY GOLDBERG, EXECUTIVE PRODUCER OF "FAMILY TIES," UBU PRODUCTIONS, LOS ANGELES, CA

Ms. PRESTON. Thank you. As you introduced me, I am a police officer with the City of Miami Police Department. I am assigned to the homicide detail, and that might sound strange for me being here because mainly what my job is is to investigate crimes.

However, during investigations we are called out on all types of deaths and I am here today just to speak on one, in particular. Back on November 6, 1986, we had the occasion to respond to a call referencing two children that were found dead inside of a clothes dryer.

We did conduct a thorough investigation as to everything that led up to the death of those two little children. During that time, I became aware, and my supervisors and members of our department, concerning child care, which is what we feel was the basic reason for what happened to those children.

The mother of those children told a story, and I guess I am here today to speak her words, that I guess she felt that we all failed her because of what happened. The woman has a job which pays her minimum wages. She does not have time that she can use as she wants to. She has to be to work or she does not have a job.

She had had a relative living with her for quite a bit of time who was keeping the children for her and without any warning that relative moved out. On Monday, the mother did not have anyone to keep her children and she stayed home to keep them.

On Monday afternoon, she checked around and tried to find someone to keep them, and someone gave her the name of a lady who ran a small day care. She contacted that lady and that lady said to her, I am only licensed to keep five children. If I keep your two, I am going to risk losing my license. I am not going to have a job, but I will do it for just this one day, and she did.

On Wednesday, the mother had a friend who worked afternoons, so that lady agreed to keep them in the morning. On Thursday, again she had the decision of what to do. She got up, she fed the children, she clothed them, and she had a long talk with them and she said I am going to go to work, but I am going to call someone to come by and be with you. I want you to be good.

She went about the house removing things that she thought were going to place her children in danger. She went to work. She worked about an hour. She called the kids and she spoke with them and she had a conversation with them that I am sure is going to stay in her mind for the rest of her life.

During that conversation, she assured them that someone was coming by. Throughout the day, over the next hour or so, she tried to call them again and she did not get any response. She started calling neighbors, friends and everyone to see if someone would go by and check on the children.

When it became a concern that she did not know what had happened, she decided I cannot work anymore; I have to leave, I have

to go home and check on my children. She got there, she did not find the children and she assumed that her sister had come by and picked them up.

A short time later, she did discover her children. When we got to the scene, so many comments were made as to what had happened because we did not really know the circumstances. I have children. I have never been placed in the situation that this lady was placed in and I learned a lot from what had happened to this woman.

She had applied for child care assistance over a two-year period and for two years she was just advised you are on the waiting list, you are on the waiting list. Our police department usually only becomes involved after some tragedy like this occurs, but now that it has come to our attention we are trying to do everything that we can to make sure that our children can receive quality day care; that the mothers can go out and work and the children are going to be safe. I do not ever want to have to go to the scene and see something like this again.

Senator DODD. Thank you very much for telling us that particular story. I should point out as well that we have a letter addressed to me from you, Marva, which I guess contains testimony. We will include that written testimony as part of the record as well.

Ms. PRESTON. Thank you, sir.

[The material referred to follows:]

City of Miami

CLARENCE DICKSON
Chief of Police

CESAR H. ODIO
City Manager

United States Senate
Committee on Labor and
Human Resources
Washington, D.C. 20510-6300

Subcommittee On Children Families
Drugs and Alcoholism
Chairman: Christopher J. Dodd
United States Senator

Mr. Dodd:

I am assigned as an investigator in the Homicide Unit of the Miami Police Department. Our job is to investigate all deaths in the City of Miami, such as murders, suicides, accidental deaths and other deaths not attended by a physician. We are very busy going from one case to another. I had to request special permission to come here. However, my supervisors felt that this was a good opportunity to express our concern for the urgent need of child care for working parents. This was brought to our attention by an investigation that we conducted. This investigation brought us face to face with a tragic reality, things some of us had only heard of.

On 6 Nov 86 at 3:45 P.M., the members of our Homicide Team (Sgt. Kaline, Det. Roberson, Det. Morin) and I responded to the scene where a 3 year old and a 4 year old were found dead inside a clothes dryer. The location was a Housing Project in the inner city of Miami. Extensive work was done on the scene, including dusting for fingerprints, photos, interviewing witnesses and collecting evidence.

The mother of the children was taken to the police station to be interviewed. Because this was a criminal investigation, she was advised of her Constitutional Rights. We learned the following: The mother was employed as a cafeteria worker. Approximately two years ago she was placed on a waiting list to receive child care assistance for her children. She had contacted the agency many times but she didn't get any help. She was not financially able to put them in a private day care center. A relative had lived with her during the past year, and she looked after the children. Without any notice, she moved out on Saturday, 1 Nov 86. On Monday, 3 Nov 86 the mother stayed home from work because she couldn't find anyone to keep them.

On Tuesday, November 4th, a woman who risked losing her license for keeping too many children agreed to keep them for that day only. On Wednesday, November 5th, a friend of hers agreed to keep them. All of this was verified.

On Thursday, 6 Nov 86, the mother could not find anyone to keep the children. She had taken the day off and was very hesitant about taking another. She finally decided that the children would be safe alone for a short time.

After she got to work, she would contact her sister or her niece and have one of them go over to look after the children. We also verified that after the mother got to work she called home and spoke with the children. She tried to call her sister to have her go by and pick up the children. She contacted several other relatives who were at work or going to work. When she called home again and did not get a response, she made numerous calls to get someone to check on the children.

She eventually left work early because no one was answering her phone. She arrived home and did not find the children. She assumed that her sister or her boyfriend had come by and picked them up. She began making phone calls as she sat down to fold clothes.

She then opened the dryer and found her children badly burned. Miami Fire Rescue responded and found the children dead.

Tests conducted on the dryer showed that a very slight pull on the ring or on the edge of the latch hole permits the door to be closed from the inside and the latch to engage. When this occurs, the door is securely shut and cannot be pulled or pushed open without actively manipulating the outer door handle. The latch mechanism is a positive engagement, not a friction type. Once the dryer is turned on, the machine does not start operating until the door is closed. If the door is open for any reason the machine will stop. Once the door is closed the machine will begin operating again. There is no reset button to start the dryer.

Using excessive weight within the dryer, we tested the dryer and found that it operated in a normal manner. This amount of weight did not cause the door to be forced open. Using the best available method, we tested the dryer to see if it could be closed from the inside. The dryer not only closed but it was firmly locked shut.

Background information showed that one of the children had a fascination for the dryer. This type dryer is no longer being manufactured. It was given to this lady by a friend.

Our investigation soon ruled out premeditated murder. Nevertheless, we were dutybound to investigate further regarding any possible criminal negligence by the mother. Our State Attorney's Office reviewed our investigation and agreed with us that there was no criminal negligence by the children's mother.

These children died because they were not supervised. Their mother felt that she had to make a decision between providing for her children by keeping her job or staying home again and risk losing her job. She wanted to be able to work and provide food and shelter, she did not want to be on welfare. She wanted her children to get to school and be among other children. She fed them before leaving and assured herself that they would be safe until she contacted someone to go over and watch them.

This lady will always have to live with the fact that the decision she made resulted in her children losing their lives. Our jobs are to try and prevent this tragedy from ever happening again.

Respectfully,

Marva H. Preston

Marva H. Preston
Detective
Homicide Unit

Senator DODD. Judy, I guess we will go on to you, since we move down the table in that direction. We thank you for being here as well today.

Marva, I do not know what time your plane is, but if you have got time to stay around for some questions, we would appreciate it.

Ms. GRIESSE. Mr. Chairman, members of the Committee, and guests, thank you for this opportunity to come and discuss family day care.

Senator DODD. You need to have to pull that microphone over to you so we can hear you.

Ms. GRIESSE. Although family day care includes children of all ages, I have had for the most part under my care the pre-school-age group, 3- to 5-year-olds. I would like to give an example of my schedule and program of activities to show you that family day care is not "babysitting," but is indeed a child care option that includes a variety of meaningful activities.

My time frame includes 7:00 a.m. to 5:30 p.m. Monday through Friday. We begin with arrival time, followed by indoor free play which includes a variety of choices such as puzzles, Lego blocks, a book corner, a dress-up corner, various toys, various blocks, a chalk board——

Senator DODD. Can you speak up in that microphone, too, Judy? Just take your time and relax; do not worry about it. Go ahead.

Ms. GRIESSE [continuing]. Puppets, a housekeeping area. This basically is a time to develop language and social skills and motor control. Sharing and independence are learned during this supervised yet unstructured time.

The next time segment is devoted to group exercise and creative movement; music activities, such as band and singing; sharing time activities and a time when we feed our pet goldfish.

Then we move into morning snack; after that, inside group activities, which I will explain in a few minutes; and board-type and conversation games. The next segment involves limited television, which includes a choice of the following excellent PBS programs: "Sesame Street"; "Mister Rogers," which focuses on each child as being special and unique; and a summertime program entitled Reading Rainbow which gets children excited about reading.

The next activity segment is outside play, weather permitting, which includes various games, playground equipment, swings and slides, sandbox, bubbles, riding toys, jump ropes, balls, et cetera, et cetera.

We then get ready for lunchtime, cleaning up, washing hands, et cetera. During lunchtime, we also play verbal games. We discuss things about food, table manners, and anything else that we wish to talk about.

Story time is next, a quiet time in preparation for nap time. Nap time or rest time comes next, followed by story time again, afternoon snack, and group activities.

Toward the end of the day, we have our clean-up-the-playroom time and, again, outside play, weather permitting. We focus on a major topic for each week; for example, maybe Valentine's Day, my family, farm animals, et cetera.

Group activities, as previously mentioned, include some of the following: working with clay, colors, numbers, number recognition,

telling time, working with the alphabet, basic shapes, painting, finger and brush, cutting and pasting.

Every Monday, we have a special afternoon cooking period in which we cook a special snack. We celebrate birthdays, have parties, holiday discussions with related activities; activities related to special weeks in the calendar; for example, Fire Prevention Week.

I make use of a very good publication, Weekly Reader Fun Day, for ages 3 to 5. The activities help to build visual and listening skills, provide practice in counting, seeing lightness and differences, motor skills reasoning, number recognition, classification, matching, and left-to-right progression. The children love this activity.

I also make use of a publication called Your Big Backyard, which is a science magazine for ages 3 to 5 published by the National Wildlife Federation. This magazine comes out monthly and is taken home by the children at the end of each month.

Two new activities I am about to introduce—are the use of USA Today newspaper to discuss current events and the taping of segments of our day so that the parents can hear us in action.

Every pre-school child has a special day designated each week to choose the game, to choose stories for story time, and to feed the fish. All of our activities are conducted under what I believe to be a relaxed atmosphere, structured but relaxed.

This concludes my example of what I believe to be a quality family day care program. Thank you.

Senator DODD. I am tired just listening to you. [Laughter.]

I just want to feed the fish. [Laughter.]

Alyce.

Nap time sounded nice, too, I might add. I think we will institute that around here. I am going to ask Senator Byrd if we can have nap time. [Laughter.]

Senator MIKULSKI. Senator, some feel that every day is nap time. [Laughter.]

Senator DODD. And you have only been here a year or so, too, I think.

Ms. CHESSNOE. Judy has talked about quality, and all these good things that are doing on in family day care homes often are not available. What I am going to direct my remarks to is the accessibility and affordability of family day care homes.

We as family day care providers offer care for 80 percent of the infants that are in child care. Often, we are the ones who take care of the special needs children, the ones that centers are not equipped to take care of.

Many times, too, we are the main backbone across the nation for those latchkey kids that were talked about earlier. We are unique in Fairfax County in that many of the latchkey kids do have choices in that there are provisions made so that there are programs in the schools.

However, this is not nationwide, and across the nation family day care providers do take care of many of these children.

However, there is another problem in accessibility, and that is, as a profession, there is a 42-percent turnover. We have one of the greatest turnovers as far as any type of employment across the nation.

Now, what we need to think about is not only how do we get more day care providers, but then how do we keep them. Fairfax County has just run a recruitment for day care providers last year. Through their multi-media campaign, they found that they were able to multiply these providers.

However, they also followed this up, and this is not just let us get the day care providers aboard, but then what do we do. One of the things is they offered classes, a referral system. They offered an umbrella program for the Department of Agriculture food program. In other words, they had other supports that were in gear that were utilized once this very successful recruitment campaign was completed.

Also, another idea is to have a mandatory registration of providers. Many times, you might hear the expression, oh, she is just an unlicensed babysitter. It is true that many times we are not licensed.

However, also, there is not even a mandatory registration so that day care providers are identified. From, for example, mandatory registration, a referral system could be built and this would solve the problem of where are they.

Also, in addition to that, when there is a mandatory registration, certain safeguards could be enacted; such things as a health and safety fire inspection, a criminal check. Also, a child abuse check could be put in gear, and these would give the nation certain safeguards that who they are having their children with during the day are indeed being protected.

In addition to that, as was mentioned before, training is very important. There is only so much that we ourselves can do to pull ourselves up by our own bootstraps. We also need help, and although we come from a county that is looked upon as being very affluent, when we are talking about the nation, we are talking about a lot of day care providers that are also working for less than poverty wages, and in this case they need help, too.

For example, money maybe could be allotted for certain institutions to, we will say, initiate a training program. This might also be tied up with the National Association for the Education of Young Children and their program with the CDA credentials.

Family day care providers have been offered the opportunity to get a CDA credential through this organization. However, many providers are not able to not only pay the $325 that is required for it—maybe this could be provided as an incentive to a long, sometimes ten-month or more requirement to get this particular certification.

As far as affordability, it must be pointed out that quite often ten percent of one's earnings goes toward child care. We are coming into a new era where maybe housing is first, but child care expenses come in second, often above food, clothing and other expenses.

For that parent who is just getting minimum wages, if $50 a week is put out in child care, that constitutes 37 percent of her income. This is not affordable. Where do we go from there? Subsidy needs to be given.

Colorado found out, from what I understand, that if child care is furnished and a parent is provided the opportunity to work, this

child care may cost 37 percent of what it might cost to put that family on welfare. So it might be looked at in terms of cost efficiency in that way.

Subsidies are needed, and more subsidies. The idea of giving, for instance, vouchers out for parents to get child care—I want to stress that one of the things that needs to be looked at is what they call free-shopping vouchers.

In other words, when these are given out they can be utilized for choices. A parent does need to have the opportunity to make a choice. As was outlined, family day care is only one option.

These need to be of an adequate amount. When a provider in an area, for example, maybe is getting $100 a week for an infant and a special service child, for example, would only have a voucher for, let us say, $62.50, that puts a real hardship on that parent to find care.

Another thing is these parents need information. They need to know where to find the child care. They need to know, for instance, what is indeed child care, and then after they go to a setting, how do they evaluate; what are the kinds of things that they are looking for, what are the kinds of questions they should be asking. Often, parents do not know.

The last thing I want to say is that perhaps the government, as one of the biggest businesses of all, could take it upon themselves as setting a good example. Maybe when we are talking about businesses taking on new initiatives, the government should look at themselves and say we are a business; maybe we are the ones who should be setting an example.

Maybe those ideas such as businesses underwriting some of the child care costs could be considered for their employees. The idea of offering an informational service, a referral service, could be put in place. Perhaps flextime could be looked at seriously.

If a two-parent family has flextime, the child then could be left at a provider——

Senator MIKULSKI. Can you talk right into the microphone?

Ms. CHESSNOE. Pardon?

Senator MIKULSKI. It is really hard to hear you.

Ms. CHESSNOE. I am sorry. Is this better?

Senator MIKULSKI. Better.

Ms. CHESSNOE. All right. I was directing attention to the government setting an example. I was mentioning that the government could, for example, have an information service, a referral service put in place, taking care of their own.

They could perhaps set up child care centers on-site nearby. Perhaps they could have flextime. For example, with a two-parent family working for the government, if they have flextime so that the one who comes to work last can drop off the child, the one who gets out the earliest could pick up the child. There would be more time with the family.

Also, for example, maybe they could institute a more liberal leave policy. So if a provider, a center, would call up the government employee and say your child is sick, that parent would be able to take off for that child without feeling any sense of guilt, job insecurity, et cetera. The government itself can look into this and be an example.

I hope that my remarks have perhaps addressed this issue. I have looked at it more or less from a family day care provider standpoint, but many of the things that I have said are also concerns for other providers in centers, too.

Thank you.

Senator DODD. Thank you very much, Alyce, for your testimony. I would point out to you, by the way, that the Senate, has a child day care program. I do not know if the House does.

Does the House have a child care program?

Senator MIKULSKI. No.

Senator DODD. Some agencies are doing some things already, but I think your point is well taken.

Gary, we welcome you. Thank you for being here.

Mr. GOLDBERG. It is nice to be here.

Senator DODD. We are glad to receive your testimony.

Mr. GOLDBERG. Thank you. This is just a relatively prepared statement.

My name is Gary Goldberg and I am the creator and executive producer of "Family Ties." More importantly, I am the man who discovered Michael J. Fox. [Laughter.]

And the voice at the end of the program which goes, "Sit, UBU, sit."

Most importantly, I am the father of two daughters, 14 and 3, and the founder of the child care center at Paramount Studios, which is the first on-site child care facility at any studio, and hopefully and certainly not the last.

What began with a crib in the corner of my office for my daughter Cailin has grown into a child care facility serving the needs of over 50 families, with children ranging in age from 2 months to 5 years. It is open 12 hours a day, 5 days a week, and all Paramount employees are eligible to use the center at a cost of $80 per week. There is scholarship money available to those for whom the $80 represents a hardship.

The idea for the center actually began to take shape in 1984. My daughter Cailin had been coming to work with me for 2 days a week for about a year-and-a-half now. My office was overstuffed with toys and games. Children's books far outnumbered scripts; mobiles hung from the ceiling.

But try as hard as I might, and as fascinating as I might think I was, it was pretty obvious that I was no longer going to be substitute for the real thing, other children. It was also obvious to me that there was no way I was going to continue to work full-time if it meant real separation from my daughter.

That daily contact with her was just too important, too special, and irreplaceable. You do not get those years back; 2 to 5 are the magic years; there are no reruns on that show.

With my older daughter Shana, I had been lucky. When she was born we ran a child care center out of the ground floor of a big old Victorian home in Berkeley. We were together all day the first 2 years of her life and it was a thrill.

It was a funky old Berkeley place known as the Organic Child Care Center. [Laughter.]

Senator DODD. A unique name in those days.

Mr. GOLDBERG. And our motto was, rain or shine, we take your kid on a trip every day. [Laughter.]

Senator DODD. Where are those children today? [Laughter.]

Mr. GOLDBERG. Hopefully, they are watching "Family Ties." [Laughter.]

Actually, it was Berkeley after all. It certainly was not for everyone, but if you wanted that kind of place with a family there, with dogs, noise, total chaos but a lot of love, then we were for you.

I think only someone who has desperately searched for child care can know that feeling of walking into a building and saying, yes, my child can be safe here, my child can grow here.

We did that for 2 years before we burned out. I think it is an area that you raised, and there are very early signs of burn-out, things that cannot be ignored. When in the evening you ask your wife for a glass of wah-wah, you know you have been doing it too long. [Laughter.]

That was happening to us. My wife went back for her master's degree at San Diego State. I went back to school in pursuit of my B.A., a pursuit which was now in its 13th year.

When we got to San Diego State, we realized something; we desperately needed child care. Fortunately, we found it there, on-site, at the university, and it was a lifesaver. Later when we moved to Los Angeles, we found the Lincoln Child Development Center in Santa Monica, which was a federally funded facility which literally saved our lives. That is not an overstatement to say that.

It saved our lives. It enabled my wife to get her Ph.D., it enabled me to pursue my career, and it put my daughter on the track to becoming the wonderful, loving, thoughtful young lady that she has become.

So I know how great those years can be. I know how important that early interaction is. I know how thrilling it is to be there for all the firsts, the first smile, the first wave, the first steps, and I knew what I would be giving up if I let Cailin out of my life.

Well, luck was still on my side because my contract with Paramount had expired about the same time that "Family Ties" became the second most watched show in television history. Paramount was eager to continue the relationship and expand our relationship and I was in a position to request and receive anything that I could think of. It was the American dream gone wild.

As I sat and pondered, I realized there was really only one thing I needed, and it was not a bigger office and it was not money and it was not a big car. I wanted a child care facility on the lot, a place where I could bring my daughter and other people could bring their daughters and sons.

The idea met heavy opposition. There were a lot of reasons why it just could not be done. A building would have to be remodeled, people would have to be moved out from those offices. There were insurance problems, safety problems, noise, you name it.

And who really wanted a child care center anyway? Did anybody care? Well, we did a survey of the Paramount community, and you bet they cared; they cared deeply. In most cases, the search for quality child care was the single most important and difficult problem these people were facing in their lives.

The idea of a quality child care facility at work was too good to be true. It was too wonderful to contemplate; it was nothing short of a lifesaver. People began holding their breath.

At this point, Rhea Perlman of "Cheers," Danny DeVito of "Taxi," and several other concerned actors and directors joined me in the fight. We enlisted the aid of Frank Mancuso, the president and CEO of Paramount Pictures. Frank Mancuso is a dedicated family man, a concerned citizen, and a visionary businessman. He is also the man who pays my salary, but I leave that out for fear of jeopardizing the credibility of that first statement.

Well, Frank got behind it full-bore and, over the concerned clucking of some old-time plant superintendents, we broke ground. On October 20, 1986, we opened and I think this is a picture that is going to play a long time.

We have found that the child care center has become a focal point for studio pride; that employees see this kind of investment in their families as the most important, positive and meaningful commitment that an employer can make.

Not only is Paramount today the most successful studio in Hollywood financially, it is also the happiest and most human, and it is not an accident in my mind that these two elements exist together side by side.

We have found employees more productive, absenteeism down, morale up. We have found that reducing the stress of balancing work and family responsibilities has uplifted the spirits and energy of all the parents who use the center, and not just the women.

I think perhaps it is the area of most pride for me that, in my mind, anyway, I think it is the men who seem to be the most affected, who seem the most eager to step out of this separated-out male provider role and into the role of nurturing, caring, loving parent.

It is the men who I see are the most freed-up and enriched. It is the men who I see who are pleased and proud to make this statement: We care about our kids, we want them in our lives, and we want them near us.

I am so sure that this is the issue for the 1980s that we are actually now starting a new television series which will come on in the fall on NBC, and hopefully to follow "Family Ties," which will center on a day care center, a child care center, and all the people whose lives interact in that facility—teachers, kids.

It is going to be very autobiographical, as was "Family Ties," which leaves only my bar mitzvah now for me to do for American television and my life will have been all over the tube. [Laughter.]

I hope you do not mind me inflicting my world view on you once a week on Thursday nights. I just want to say that the results for us have been nothing short of spectacular and the child care center has positively affected every aspect of studio life, not just for those who use it directly, but also those who pass by the center on the way to their office, who are attracted by the siren song of children at play, stop outside the backyard and maybe peek in, maybe pick up a ball and toss it back, maybe stop inside and paint a picture, maybe read a book out loud, maybe just smile and keep on walking, their work day humanized and brightened by the music and colors of having children close at hand.

Thank you.

Senator DODD. Thank you very much, Gary, for that, and again we appreciate your being here. You have been involved in child care for so long and have seen it from every angle imaginable. So we appreciate your testimony and your comments.

Let me, if I can, Marva, ask just a few questions and we will try not to keep everyone too long here. We just heard Gary talk about the reaction of the men at Paramount. What is the policy of the Miami Police Department with regard to child care?

Ms. PRESTON. Well, I guess basically the same thing. I feel that when I am at work, I am living in a male world because right now I am the only female who works in homicide, and I guess to the outside world these guys put on this big macho image that they present to the public.

But, you know, I know them as fathers who are concerned about child care. During the past couple months, we have had information passed on to us, people taking a survey as to starting a day care center within the police department, and it is mainly because, you know, we operate on a 24-hour basis, we have instant call-in.

I think it is necessary for us because not everywhere can you go at 11:00 at night and you are going to be able to take your child to a day care center and be able to come to work, and those hours we do have to work.

So the men in our department are very involved. They would not tell you this, but I can tell you they are very involved in it. [Laughter.]

Senator DODD. And they are supportive in this effort?

Ms. PRESTON. Yes.

Senator DODD. Aside from the tragic case that you talked about, was there any other specific event that triggered your efforts to promote child care at the Miami Police Department? When did you begin to promote the idea of child care at the Miami Police Department?

Ms. PRESTON. Well, I have worked with children. Like I said, I have worked in homicide for about 6 years, but during an 8-month period I worked in a battery unit, which consisted of sexual battery and child abuse, and all that.

So many times, I hit a wall when trying to do things for people and trying to get help for the children, and I tried to become more aware of the agencies that could lend assistance and be able to give information to the public about what we can do to help out children, places they can go that they can find day care and find help for the children.

Senator DODD. And that is what triggered it?

Ms. PRESTON. Yes.

Senator DODD. And how is it coming? Where are you in the process of getting something established there?

Ms. PRESTON. We have got different agencies in Miami, Dade County, that now are starting up. When people do need assistance, they do not just pass you on from one to the other.

Our State attorney's office, our health and rehabilitative services, all these people now are working along with the police department. When we have problems like this, we are able not just to refer people, but actually get help for them.

Senator DODD. That is very worthwhile.

Judy, both you and Alyce really have gone into some detail here about the work that you do as child care providers. Obviously, it is a far more difficult job than what someone described as a babysitting job.

I introduced legislation, which has now become law, that provides scholarship funding for the training of low-income women or people who would like to become professionals, in the area of child care.

What kinds of training programs would both of you recommend? Not everybody who comes to this profession has 26 years of collective experience as teachers as the two of you do. That obviously would be the ideal situation. But you are the exception, not the rule.

What would you recommend in training programs for people who are interested in becoming child care providers?

Ms. CHESSNOE. Fairfax County offers a 30-hour course for child care providers, and this covers the gamut of issues, from growth and development, first aid, CPR training, the various business aspects, legal aspects of child care.

This whets the appetite, and these 30 hours then, I think, inspire one to continue learning. For example, they will then have additional classes throughout the years and then, of course, over the years one can take many, many classes.

This would be feasible to do, and because it is a small scale it would be possible to have this kind of training. The other kind of training I was talking about was more extensive. This was through universities, setting up, for example, longer-term classes.

For example, where childhood growth and development might be taking up one or two classes, then more extensive training could be gotten in these areas. This, we see as maybe the next step up and this would be a big advantage in ensuring quality child care.

Also, on the part of the providers, the more they invest in their profession and in themselves, the more likely they are to stick with it.

Senator DODD. Judy, if you were a parent without the expertise you have, what would be the five or six things you would look for in a child care center?

Imagine you are new to a community, say you had just arrived in Washington, DC, and you want to pick out the best child care facility possible. What are the five, six, or ten things that you ought to watch for as a parent?

Ms. GRIESSE. I would look for safety factors.

Senator DODD. You have to really speak into that microphone.

Ms. GRIESSE. I would look for safety factors.

Senator DODD. Yes.

Ms. GRIESSE. I would look for turnover rate within the staff. I would look for the program of activities. I would look for what types of feedback parents get, conferences. I would visit more than one time. I would want to stay long enough to observe adult/child interaction. Other major factors to look for include licensing, cleanliness of facility, qualifications and experience of staff members, teacher/pupil ratio.

The turnover rate is the thing that really disturbs me the most in child care because it is so important for children, especially when they are young, to have that sort of bonding with one person.

In many centers, for example, or even with family day care, the turnover is so great that the children can be settled with someone, only to find that person is moving on to other things next week or next month.

Senator DODD. Yes.

Ms. GRIESSE. That is something that disturbs me.

Senator DODD. How much of that do you relate to salary?

Ms. GRIESSE. A lot. That is a very big factor.

Senator DODD. Sixty, seventy percent of the problem?

Ms. GRIESSE. More than that. People who are involved with child care—that is not a glamorous type of job. It is not something that everyone wants to be. I cannot count how many times people have said to me, Judy, I would not do what you are doing for a million dollars.

The perception is that people in child care have to be crazy to be doing this work. I mean, I do not know what they envision, children running all through your house, this kind of thing.

When my husband tells people at work the kind of work I do, they just cannot believe it and they say, how can you stand that, children running all over your house? He says that is not the picture, that is not the way it is.

Senator DODD. Yes.

Ms. GRIESSE. But the turnover rate is very important. I would want to know that, taking my child to a center.

Senator DODD. Any other comments on that, Alyce?

Ms. CHESSNOE. One of the other things that causes a big turnover is stress. A lot of day care providers are in a very stressful profession, and one of the reasons is we are out there alone.

We are not the ones that can take off and have a coffee break and just let out steam for a few minutes during the day. We are not the ones that can sit at lunchtime and have our feet up in the air and relax. We are with the kids every single minute.

Senator DODD. Yes.

Ms. CHESSNOE. And with this being with the kids on the job and doing various things with them, it does cause stress, and that is why, for instance, when I talked about some of the employer initiatives, all of these, as they relieve stress for the parents, believe me, they relieve stress for the day care providers.

Senator DODD. Sure.

Ms. CHESSNOE. This is important. It is kind of addressing the issue through the back door, but it does addressing it.

Senator DODD. I will get to you, Gary, in a second, but maybe you can pipe in on this. Take, for instance, the notion of creating ongoing training through television programming with "Sesame Street" or other programs—what are the latest techniques in this area?

And for Judy and Alyce, how would you feel about something like that?

Ms. CHESSNOE. Well, I think that any issue that is addressed through multi-media—we are reaching different people at different times in different ways, and whether we use, for instance, local

governments, whether we utilize the universities and institutions of higher learning, whether we use TV, that is another one.

And might I also add, our organization, too, is doing its bit to pull the profession up by its bootstraps, we too have meetings that address child care concerns. By doing this, we too are raising, we feel, the professionalism in Fairfax County.

Senator DODD. Gary, we are going to hold hearings on this over the next several months, and really push to see if we cannot get a decent piece of legislation adopted.

We can hold hearings here every day for the next year and we will have only a fraction of the impact you can have with a program on television that is a sitcom, that talks about child care and child care facilities.

I just cannot tell you how effective television has been, as when shows like "Roots," and the "Holocaust" reached Americans on civil rights. Television shows like those reach people in a way that hearings and documentaries cannot seem to. So I applaud you for that idea of a sitcom on childcare.

A constituent of mine in Connecticut, Susan Saint James, has a permanent cast member of her show who is mentally retarded. That has done an incredible amount of good for enlightening the public about people who are mentally retarded. It has helped show the public what they can do and how they can be productive citizens.

So I would suggest to you, you have a great amount of influence in terms of building public support for child care in this country. Having saddled you with that—[Laughter.]

Mr. GOLDBERG. It is real interesting to hear Judy and Alyce speak, because when we started to do the child care center, what we came up against was low salaries and we were frankly appalled. I mean, we were trying to get the best people and we have tried in our way not to blast out the whole industry, you know, but to try to start there to really raise the salary, so at least Paramount Studios is saying these are people we value; we are going to pay them commensurate with their value in our lives. It was really a shock to us to find the low level of pay.

What is interesting as we approached our day care show, and this also touches on the area you were talking about, is to try to demythify this negative image of what it is to spend all day with kids. We think it is romantic, we think it is sexy, and this is one of the things we want to show.

Senator DODD. You have your work cut out for you. [Laughter.]

Mr. GOLDBERG. No, no. I mean, I have spent those days and if you woke me up in the middle of the night and asked me what the sexiest image is I would have for myself, I would say it somehow involved a baby and carrying them and being with them.

The character that we have, the main character, is going to be kind of a stock broker or some mainstream successful person who, when faced with the birth of a second child, does not want to be as absent as he was for the birth of his first child, and the couple themselves—she herself thought her biological clock was on snooze; you know, that they were both going in a different direction.

It is the reverse of "Family Ties." Those are people who did everything and then became mainstream. These are people who were mainstream and now go back to a much simpler life.

I think one of the things we are going to try to show there is, you know, the positive aspects of that both for the relationship and for the people themselves, you know. I think we can do this. If we can get one more guy like Michael Fox, this thing can work real well. [Laughter.]

Senator DODD. We are holding this hearing because we have seen a big gap out there. You mentioned the problems you ran into when you raised the idea of starting a child care facility at Paramount.

We had the same reaction when we held hearings in the past on this subject. We had witnesses who testified about the problems of child care, without ever having tried to set up a facility in their businesses.

When you have witnesses who have tried it, they all testify how effective have child care programs are from a purely business standpoint—in terms of increasing productivity and employee retention and reducing absenteeism.

You have mentioned all of those points. Has Paramount done any study on the economic impact of this?

Mr. GOLDBERG. I think that would be hard for them to determine, but I know all the people who have stayed at Paramount who will never leave now. So their economic benefit is going to really come down the line, writers, producers, actors, people who just really consider Paramount Studios home in a way that they never thought they could feel about a studio.

The other thing is all the people who were opposed to this, the ones who were most vehemently opposed are now the strongest advocates of it. They are the ones who want us to expand; they are the ones who want us to go upstairs now and do a second story, because we have a waiting list for infants.

There is no down side to it in our experience. As I said, it has just enhanced the life of everyone who comes in contact with it.

Senator DODD. Well, with your permission, I would like you to participate in a few other forums with the National Chamber of Commerce, the Business Roundtable, and others. I mean that.

Mr. GOLDBERG. Maybe I could gather those statistics. That would be specifically helpful.

Senator DODD. It would be helpful.

Mr. GOLDBERG. Yes.

Senator DODD. I find that IBM has been terrific: industry-wide, they have child care assistance programs. We have countless witnesses come forward from the private sector, but the more we can get coming forward the better. I just feel that the business community is suspicious of people in the public sector, suspicious of people who are so-called activists on this subject matter.

I think there is a greater willingness on their part to listen to their peers, who have to look at bottom lines every day. They are preoccupied with the bottom line.

My information is that the bottom line has been substantially enhanced as a result of child care and that it is a good business issue. We need more people in business who will say that. I say it,

and obviously there is a problem with a Senator or a Congressman making those kinds of statements.

Someone as successful as you, has a wider audience than we have on the subject matter.

Mr. GOLDBERG. Well, I take the bottom line to sleep with me at night, so I know what it is and it has been just dramatically improved at Paramount in this last year.

Senator DODD. Well, we will try to take you on the road when it is possible.

Senator Mikulski.

Senator MIKULSKI. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, just a few questions.

First, to you, Detective Preston, your story about the cafeteria worker was most gripping and wrenching, and I think shows the plight of what low-income women face as they try to reach out with either the lack of community support or family support.

There are no longer the old neighborhoods where families are working. Even grandma is now working and is not there to take care of the kids.

But in addition to our poor people, you represent a particular group of women. You, as a detective on a police force, your counterparts in the field of nursing, are in fields that require shift work. You are on call. If there is a murder to be solved, you are not looking at your watch and saying, well, I have got to go home now.

Very often, I know that you work nights. You work on weekends. That means that day care or dependent care is not readily available. My question is, because I think about women like yourself with very responsible positions who have jobs around the clock or night duty or whatever, how do you locate day care, and how do your counterparts on the force and other women in similar positions do that?

Ms. PRESTON. It is very difficult. I work 3 to 11. I have not worked a day job in about 6 years. I am fortunate that I have a husband, and my husband and I take turns keeping our kids.

But it is very difficult, like I say, not just for the women, but for the men that I work with. We are on call. Sometimes I get called at three o'clock in the morning and I do have to go in and handle a murder.

I think that the idea of starting a day care center within our police department is going to help not only me personally, but it is going to help the department because, you know, our response rate is going to be much faster. If we know that we can come into our police department and we are going to have somewhere that we can place our children and not have to worry about them, we are going to be able to do better jobs.

Senator MIKULSKI. But that is for pre-school children. You see, what I am trying to get out is the location of day care and then the availability of day care. We often think of day care as a 9-to-5 business, and yet you indicate that the need is not only for pre-school kids, but I am sure as a police officer you are a firm believer in proper after-school supervision of school-age children.

Therefore, I am looking at recommendations or even experiences for—do you see the need, for example, for one-stop shops where police officers, nurses, medical people, people involved in shift work

could actually call and say what is the day care available in my neighborhood or close to my workplace?

Do you even know if those services are available in the Miami area?

Ms. PRESTON. As far as I know, those services are not available because, you know, I have heard people—you know, we work closely with some of the people in the hospitals and I have heard people mention the fact that when it is time for me to come to work, I do not know where to take my child.

You know, other than the people that work the day shift, people do not know what to do, and it has become a problem. Like you say, people do not just sit at home now and the grandmothers—people have to have day care centers to take children to.

Senator MIKULSKI. One of the things that you heard Senator Hatch and I talk about that Senator Dodd has been supportive of is the funding of systems called information and referral; essentially, one-stop shops where parents or businesses could call and say what is the licensed child care available in a community and what are their hours of operating.

Whether you are the head of the personnel department in an aggressive police department or whether you are a parent, do you think that that is a very needed service within a community and would go a long way in helping to deal with the stress that people face if they had a place to call where they at least could get a list of day care centers to visit?

Ms. PRESTON. Absolutely; we definitely need that. As far as I know, that is not—like I say, we do not have that available to us right now, and I do not know if it is even in action as far as getting it done, but it is needed with all the different type jobs that we have and the work that we are doing.

Senator MIKULSKI. So information and referral even of what is existing would be a big help to you?

Ms. PRESTON. Yes.

Senator MIKULSKI. Thank you, and congratulations on that new graduate you have.

Ms. PRESTON. Thank you.

Senator MIKULSKI. Now, just a few questions for Ms. Griesse and—is it Chessnoe?

Ms. CHESSNOE. Chessnoe.

Senator MIKULSKI. My questions would be, are you regulated and should you be regulated from zoning to qualifications to provide child care?

Ms. CHESSNOE. Fairfax County is unique even in the State of Virginia. As far as saying are we licensed, no. Of the projected 6,000 day care homes in Fairfax County, 3 have a license.

The reason that more are not licensed is because zoning at the present time realistically prohibits it. Of the many who have tried, only three have persevered long enough to get it.

Senator MIKULSKI. Can I just interrupt you and identify what, then, is that problem? Is it that people do not want a child care program in their community? Is it community opposition? Is it red tape? Is it complications dealing with municipal agencies?

Ms. CHESSNOE. All of the above. There is a lot of red tape involved. For instance, one personal friend, a provider, tried to go

through the red tape and for a whole year, every time they said jump, she jumped. She thought she had it all in order.

It came down to the last analysis and the board was called. One neighbor objected and her license was not approved because it would supposedly alter the traffic pattern of the neighborhood and change it.

Often, the redtape is so much that a provider does not even get past, we will say, the first initial phone calls and the first papers that need to be filled out. There is also an expense to that, too, not only initial expense and expense in meeting the requirements, whatever they say, but then the expense continues.

Senator DODD. It should be pointed out that Fairfax County does not require licensing.

Ms. CHESSNOE. No. There is not a license required if one takes care of five or less children in one's home.

Senator MIKULSKI. Should there be?

Ms. CHESSNOE. I can say that the State of Virginia just had a child care conference. I was there. One recommendation was made that all child care providers, centers, et cetera, be licensed.

Senator MIKULSKI. Do you support that?

Ms. CHESSNOE. I support that. I feel that there should be some kind of a—if you want to call it license, fine, but there should be some kind of registration, accreditation, license for everyone. Everyone should be accounted for and accountable.

I think they should be accountable for safety and they should be accountable for quality, and we as professionals also believe that, too.

Senator MIKULSKI. Well, let me posit something else. I am a big believer in one-stop shops, going back to my own social work days and being bounced around, and my city council days and trying to help people who were being bounced around, whether that is the call to locate a day care center or for sincere people who would like to provide child care in their own home or in the community.

Do you feel that what we would need if we were looking at this is for people like yourselves who want to get started, there needs to be a place, particularly, say, in municipal government that would be a one-stop shop that people would go to and say I want to do this; what do I need to do and what type of technical assistance can you provide for me?

Therefore, that would deal with the checklist related to zoning, safety, insurance to be provided. Also, in turn, municipal government says if you are going to do this, what we expect you to be, and this is a high school graduate who has had x amount of training, whatever those criteria would be.

But you would not be bouncing around, and also there would be on the part of municipal government an attitude to work with you to solve a community problem, rather than you are the community problem.

Ms. CHESSNOE. We strongly support that, too, and one of the things that was brought up in the Virginia conference was the fact that there are so many agencies now that are involved at different levels. There are also many differences of opinion; there are different interpretations, et cetera, of any regulation, et cetera.

What we felt is there should be, we will say, a level up here that would be, we will say, the accounting. Everybody would be accountable to maybe a State organization or a federal agency.

But then, as you are talking about, many of the responsibilities are better enacted if they are done on a local level, and then for those providers and parents who are not in a local area that has this, there might have to be regional offices that would take care of the borderline fringe areas.

Senator MIKULSKI. Well, Mr. Chairman, I could ask lots of questions, but I know we want to move on. Just a few quick comments to Mr. Goldberg.

First, Mr. Goldberg, I would like to thank you as someone who lives his politics and who takes a personal situation and moves it to a political or policy level. Also, your stories concentrate on people's day-to-day needs, the fact that doing the ordinary is important; that paying attention to the day-to-day is the way our country will work; also, that this is a serious issue.

I noted in the press comments that when women call for child care in the workplace, they are whining. When men call for child care in the workplace, it is a serious issue and we have to make accommodations. So we think that that is great.

I would encourage you, though, when you do your stories—and I am glad you are going to show the new man who wants to go riding with his children, and so on, but I can tell you that very often the jocks that I deal with in the business community feel that is a quickey-poo approach, and therefore just dismiss it.

So they say, well, that is the quickey-poo crowd over here, but we bottom-line guys do not get involved in that. So we hope that when you tell your story that in addition to a sensitive, caring person like yourself, you have got John Wayne out there changing the baby's diapers. [Laughter.]

Senator DODD. Quit being a quickey-poo. [Laughter.]

Senator MIKULSKI. The other thing that I hope your story deals with is the fact that there are really ambivalent feelings in this society for women's participation in the work force.

We know that men are interested, we know that it is a family issue. But ultimately in our society, the responsibility for the location and provision of child care often does fall on the mom.

What we find, and I think this is what Senator Dodd was talking to, when we deal with the hard-liners and the bottom-liners, they want women in the work force, particularly for the subsidized, cheap labor that we provide, and a hostility toward raising the minimum wage, the hostility to providing parental leave, and now child care.

Yet, at the same time, they want us in the workplace. They do not want to provide the supportive services, the wages and the services for us to be there. I think the attitude of most of us is that Mother's Day should not just be once a year; that Mother's Day should be every day, to enable us to fulfill our responsibilities and meet the financial needs of our family.

If you can get that across in 30 minutes, it is better than what we do in these filibusters and we thank you for it.

Senator DODD. Thank you, Senator Mikulski, very much.

Senator Pell has joined us.

Senator PELL. I have no questions. Thank you very much.

Senator DODD. Any statement you may have for the record, we will include, certainly.

Senator PELL. I congratulate you on organizing this hearing and wish you well.

Senator DODD. Thank you very much.

We thank all four of you for coming. We look forward to staying in touch with you. Gary, particularly, we are going to get back to you and take you on the road with this.

Mr. GOLDBERG. I am ready.

Senator DODD. Thank you again for coming.

Mr. GOLDBERG. Thank you.

Senator DODD. Our next panel of witnesses, I will introduce as they come up to the table. Ed Zigler is the Director of the Yale Bush Center in Child Development and Social Policy from my home State of Connecticut; Toni Porter, who is the Director of Research and Program Development, Child Care, Inc., from New York; Nancy Travis, who is the Director of the Southern States Program of Save the Children in Atlanta; and Caro Pemberton, who is from the Child Care Employee Project, Oakland, CA. We welcome all of you here.

Ed Zigler, needs very little introduction, if any, before this subcommittee. He has spent more time here than I think I have, over the years, especially in the last couple of years.

He has been a good advisor and a guide in the whole range of children and family issues from the time I set up the Children's Caucus. The rest of this Subcommittee has been fortunate as well because I know he has traveled out to Utah for Senator Hatch to speak at conferences.

He has just done marvelous work. He has set up many programs. He is one of the founders of Head Start, founder of the Child Development Associate credentialing program, and has been one of the leading voices on child care for the past two decades.

Toni Porter, as I mentioned, is from Child Care, Inc., in New York. It is a private, not-for-profit resource and referral agency in New York City. We will be hearing firsthand about the efforts of parents to find child care in New York, which has got to be one of the most difficult jobs imaginable.

Nancy Travis has been involved in the issues going back to 1942. Do you want me to really mention that? I was not going to mention that today. I was going to lie and say 1982, and people would be impressed anyway.

Save the Children, I am proud to say, is a private, non-profit organization based in Westport, CT. It has been a pioneer in family day care in the Southern States program. They have also operated a resource and referral service for parents with a free community line and for employees of several corporations, in that area.

Caro Pemberton is the Associate Director of the Child Care Employee Project, national resource clearinghouse for those working to upgrade the status, salaries and working conditions of the child care profession. She will be able to tell us about the relationship of the salaries of child care workers to the availability and quality of child care.

So we welcome all four of you and thank you for being here with us this morning. Ed, we began on the right the last time; I will begin on the left with this panel and we will start with you. Once again, we thank you for being here.

The rules of the road are the same for everybody. Your statements will be made a part of the record. Try, if you can, to keep your statements relatively brief so we can get to the questions, which sometimes are more enlightening in terms of eliciting information for the Committee.

STATEMENTS OF EDWARD ZIGLER, DIRECTOR, YALE BUSH CENTER IN CHILD DEVELOPMENT AND SOCIAL POLICY, NEW HAVEN, CT; TONI PORTER, DIRECTOR OF RESEARCH AND PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT, CHILD CARE, INC., NEW YORK, NY; NANCY TRAVIS, DIRECTOR, SOUTHERN STATES OFFICE, SAVE THE CHILDREN, ATLANTA, GA; AND CARO PEMBERTON, CHILD CARE EMPLOYEE PROJECT, OAKLAND, CA

Mr. ZIGLER. Thank you, Senator Dodd. I have a longer statement which I will insert in the record. I do have a few opening remarks.

Your figures were correct at the opening of these hearings, Senator Dodd. We are now in a situation where 70 percent of all school-age children and 50 percent of all pre-schoolers, including infants under one year of age, are in out-of-home care.

Their parents and concerned citizens everywhere are troubled about the potential consequences of this new form of care. Effects cannot be predicted, however, without knowing the quality of the care.

The right question is less the general query what are the effects of out-of-home care. The right question is what are the differing effects of out-of-home care of a different range of qualities?

Considerable research has been carried out on this issue. It is reassuring that behavioral scientists have once again confirmed common sense in their startling discovery that high-quality care is better for children than is low-quality care. [Laughter.]

In addition, it appears that after the age of 2, high-quality care may even be beneficial for children from low-income families. Clearly, quality is the central issue in the child care debate.

This has not been sufficiently acknowledged. Many appear to believe that day care is merely a means of removing one impediment to parents' participation in the work force. Two of your previous witnesses used the term "keeping children." The only place there should be keepers is zoos.

The logical consequence of this belief that you are just taking care of a child so parents can work is an effort to provide the greatest quantity of child care for the lowest possible price.

In fact, every parent must know and this committee must know that what is being purchased is the child's daily environment for months and even years, an environment which must affect the child's development.

Day care environments can be rated on a continuum from good to bad. Along that continuum, there is a minimal threshold below which children's development will be impaired if the child experiences that environment.

Standards are merely an effort to guarantee that children do not receive care below this threshold. There is no controversy among experts as to what minimum standards define this boundary. In fact, the degree of consensus is surprising in a field usually fraught with conflict. Experts concur that staff-child ratios, group size, and staff training affect children's development.

Our nation has been struggling with the problems of standards for almost two decades, and I have the scars to prove it. When the original FIDCR was established in enforceable form in 1971, the Office of Child Development under my direction was responsible for the day care component of President Nixon's proposed family assistance plan.

Even then, decisionmakers within HEW were conflicted over the question of the federal government's role in promulgating standards. This conflict was wisely resolved by one of our nation's finest civil servants, Elliott Richardson, then Secretary of HEW, who argued that we owed children day care protection no less than the aged in nursing homes.

These standards become moot, however, with the collapse of the family assistance plan. The 1971 standards were slightly revised in 1980 in an effort led by the Children's Defense Fund.

The revised standards were endorsed by Secretary Patricia Harris of the Carter Administration after a lengthy analysis within HHS and sent to Congress for their consideration. Congress took no action, pending further cost studies, and these standards quietly vanished without a trace.

The most recent effort to produce standards in 1985 was precipitated by the urging of the Congress to HHS. The result can only be described as a travesty. Instead of simply updating the thoroughly-researched, developmentally sound standards of 1980, the problem of child care quality was ignored, and instead the focus was on sexual abuse, an exceedingly rare occurrence in child care settings.

The real problem is less the rare occurrence of sexual abuse in centers. The real problem is that so many children are receiving unregulated care or care regulated at so low a level as to compromise children's development.

To make this matter concrete, let us look at the current heated debate concerning the consequences of out-of-home care for infants. Experts concur, and both the 1971 and 1980 reflected, the need for a ratio of one adult for every three infants.

At present in this entire nation, only three States require a 3-to-1 ratio. Many more allow 8-to-1. No one, no matter how well trained, can adequately care for eight infants. States with standards such as these are guaranteeing that their children will grow up to be less than they might have been.

Why have States advocated such inadequate standards? In a word, cost. Good child care is labor-intensive and very expensive, up to $600 a month for pre-schoolers in major urban centers. Only the wealthy can afford such costs, and as a result we are witnessing the ominous development in our nation of a two-tiered system of care for children.

Affluent parents are purchasing excellent care. The poor, the working class, and even the lower middle-class are often forced by

financial constraints to place their children in settings which put these children at risk often as early as a few weeks after birth.

The quality of child caregivers is central to the issue of standards, and we will make little inroad on the problem of quality until the training, status, and salary of child caregivers is upgraded.

At present, child caregivers are generally women earning below the minimum wage for the children of other low-wage-earners. Over 15 years ago, we at the Office of Child Development attempted to ameliorate the problem of insufficiently trained, inadequately compensated caregivers by creating the Child Development Associate Program, a performance-based child caregiver training and credentialing program.

Our goal was to produce 100,000 such workers in a decade. Today, a decade-and-a-half later, there are only 15,000 CDAs. In fact, this effort almost collapsed and the Reagan Administration should be complimented, since they, in collaboration with the National Association for Young Children, saved the program.

The Reagan people, however, made an error, as you have already heard, in placing the cost of the credential beyond the means of many who work with children, and I would like to commend the wisdom of two members of this committee, Senators Dodd and Hatch, who championed funds for scholarships for those unable to afford the CDA child care training.

While child care standards pose a complex problem, it is one that demands a speedy solution. Either HHS or our nation's most knowledgeable workers should be called together and asked to provide standards once again.

If nothing else, the federal government should ensure that parents are informed of what constitutes good care. Too often, parents believe that the State would neither permit nor register care that is not optimal.

In fact, in a State-by-State survey I conducted with my colleague, Katherine Young, of child care requirements, that survey has made clear that such regulations vary from the excellent to the God-awful.

In addition, 56 percent of children are not in centers but in family day care, the majority of which are unlicensed and unregulated. The care in these homes can best be characterized as heterogeneous, as an important survey conducted by the National Council of Jewish Women has indicated. That is where you find the very best and the very worst.

What must be remembered is that the developmental needs of children in each and every State are pretty much the same. One can only wonder why some States require that these needs be met while other States do not.

[The prepared statement of Mr. Zigler follows:]

Policy Recommendations on Child Care

Edward Zigler
Sterling Professor of Psychology
and
Director, Yale Bush Center in Child Development and Social Policy

Testimony presented to the United States Senate
Subcommittee on Children, Families, Drugs,
and Alcoholism

Washington, D.C. June 11, 1987

Seventy-five percent of all school-aged children and 50% of all pre-schoolers, including infants, have mothers in the workforce. Many of these children have been placed in out-of-home care. Their parents and concerned citizens are troubled about the potential consequences of this new form of care. Effects cannot be predicted, however, without knowing the quality. The right question is less the general query "what are the effects of out-of-home care?" than "what are the differing effects of out-of-home care of a range of qualities?"

Considerable research has been carried out on this issue. It is reassuring that behavioral scientists have once again confirmed commonsense in their startling discovery that high quality care is better for children than is low quality care. In addition, it appears that after the age of 2 high quality care may even be beneficial for children from low-income families. Clearly, quality is the central issue in the child care debate.

This has not been sufficiently acknowledged. Many appear to believe that day care is merely a means of removing one impediment to parent's participation in the workforce. The logical consequence of this belief is an effort to provide the greatest quantity of child care for the lowest possible price. In fact what is being purchased is the child's daily environment for months and even years, an environment which must affect their development.

Day care environments can be arrayed on a continuum from good to bad. Along that continuum, there is a minimum threshold below which children's development will be impaired. Standards are merely an effort to guarantee that children do not receive care below this threshold.

There is no controversy as to what minimum standards define this boundary, in fact the degree of consensus is surprising in a field usually fraught with conflict. Experts concur that staff-child ratios, group size, and staff

training affect children's development.

Our nation has been struggling with the problem of standards for almost two decades. When the original FIDCR were established in 1971, the Office of Child Development under my direction, was responsible for the day care component of President Nixon's proposed Family Assistance Plan. Even then, decisionmakers within HEW were conflicted over the now familiar question of the federal government's role in promulgating standards. This conflict was wisely resolved by one of our finest civil servants, Elliott Richardson, then Secretary of HEW, who argued that we owed children in day care protection no less than the aged in nursing homes. Those standards became moot, however, with the collapse of FAP. The 1971 standards were slightly revised in 1980 in an effort led by the Children's Defense Fund. The revised standards were endorsed by secretary Patricia Harris of the Carter Administration after a lengthy analysis within HHS, and sent to Congress for their consideration. Congress took no action pending further cost studies, and they quietly vanished without a trace. The most recent effort to produce standards in 1985 were precipitated by the urging of Congress to HHS. The result can only be described as a travesty. Instead of simply updating the thoroughly researched, developmentally sound standards of 1980 the problem of child care quality was ignored and instead the focus was on sexual abuse - an exceedingly rare occurence in child care settings. The real problem is less rare occurence of sexual abuse in centers than that so many children are receiving unregulated care, or care regulated at so low a level as to compromise children's development.

To make this matter concrete, let us look at the current heated debate concerning the consequences of out-of-home care for infants. Experts concur, and both the 1971 and 1980 standards reflected, the need for a ratio of one

adult for every three infants. At present, of the entire nation, only 3 states require a 3:1 ratio. Many more allow 8:1. No one, no matter how well trained, can adequately care for 8 infants. States with standards such as these are guaranteeing that their children will grow up to be less than they might have been.

Why have states advocated such inadequate standards? In a word, cost. Good child care is labor intensive, and very expensive; up to $600 a month for pre-schoolers in major urban centers. Only the wealthy can afford such costs, and as a result, we are witnessing the ominous development of a two-tiered system of care. Affluent parents are purchasing excellent care. The poor, the working-class, and even the lower-middle-class are often forced by financial constraints to place their children in settings which put them at risk, often as early as a few weeks after birth. When these children enter the workforce, the differences in their upbringing will remain.

The quality of child caregivers is central to the issue of standards, and we will make little inroad on the problem of quality until the training, status, and salary of child caregivers is upgraded. At present, child caregivers are generally women earning below the minimum wage caring for the children of other low wage earners. Over 15 years ago, we at the Office of Child Development attempted to ameliorate the problem of insufficiently trained, inadequately compensated caregivers by creating the Child Development Associate program, a performance-based child caregiver training and credentialing program. Our goal was to produce 100,000 such workers in a decade. Today, a decade and a half later, there are only 15,000 CDAs. In fact the effort almost collapsed and the Reagan administration should be complimented since they in collaboration with the National Association for Young Children saved the program. The Reagan people made an error, however, in placing the cost of the credential beyond the

means of many who work with children, and I would like to commend the wisdom of two members of this Committee, Senators Dodd and Hatch, who championed funds for scholarships for those unable to afford the CDA child care training.

While childcare standards pose a complex problem, it is one that demands a speedy solution. Either HHS or our nation's most knowledgeable workers should be asked to provide standards. If nothing else, the federal government should ensure that parents are informed of what constitutes good care. Too often, parents believe that the state would neither permit nor register care that is not optimal. In fact, in a state-by-state survey I conducted with my colleague Katherine Young of child care requirements has made clear that such regulations vary from the excellent to the god-awful. In addition, 56% of children are not in centers, but in family day care, the majority of which are unlicensed. The care in these homes can best be characterized as heterogeneous, as an important survey conducted by the National Council of Jewish Women has indicated.

What must be remembered is that the developmental needs of children in each and every state are pretty much the same. One can only wonder why some states require that these needs be met, while other states do not.

Senator DODD. Thank you very much, Ed, for your testimony. As always, you do not mince words, and we thank you for your comments.

Toni, we will begin with you.

Ms. PORTER. OK. Good morning, Senator Dodd, Senator Mikulski.

Senator DODD. Bring that microphone right up to you.

Ms. PORTER. How is that?

Senator DODD. Great.

Ms. PORTER. Good enough, OK.

My name is Toni Porter. I am the Director of Research and Program Development of Child Care, Inc. Child Care, Inc., is a private, non-profit child care resource and referral agency in New York City, like those you have been talking about, Senator Mikulski.

Like the 200 other child care resource and referral agencies across the country, we provide three primary services to our own community—information and advice to parents who need child care, technical assistance to new child care programs, and public education and advocacy on child care issues for parents and providers alike. We also have 16 contracts with corporations in New York City that have a combined work force of 62,000 employees.

We speak from 12 years of experience working with parents, working with providers, and working with our own elected officials in Albany and New York City.

There seems to be a pervasive notion in this country that families, especially low-income families, can make do with "informal" child care arrangements. An expert at a the conference on welfare reform in our city recently made just such a statement.

Yet, evidence from our own information service and Detective Preston's story point to the contrary. Families call us when the sister they had counted on to care for their 3-month-old takes a job, when the grandmother who has taken care of their 9-month-old becomes seriously ill, when their neighbor moves and they no longer have care for their 16-month-old toddler. These families are not making do; they are doing without.

Last year, we received calls from more than 4,000 parents who needed child care. Close to half of the requests were for care for infants and toddlers. Approximately one-third were for full-day care, and one in every two calls was from a parent who was eligible for publicly-subsidized care.

Who are the parents of these babies? They are the two-earner families who cannot afford the $200 to $300-a-week cost for an in-home caregiver and who want good, safe care for their infants.

They are the single-parent families who need child care while they support their households, and who need a stable, consistent child care arrangement. And they are the young mothers who need child care to enroll in job training or welfare-to-work programs and who want the advantages that good child care offers for their children.

Our counselors try to help these families, but they have a hard task in New York City. The shortage for child care for infants and toddlers is extreme. There are 68,000 young children too in our city who need out-of-home care while their parents work.

But there are, all told, 5,000 licensed spaces for infants and toddlers; only 120 licensed day care homes to serve all of the children who cannot gain care inside the publicly subsidized system.

This means that only 7 percent of our very youngest children in New York City can be accommodated in programs that meet the kind of standards that Professor Zigler has referred to.

As a result, thousands of parents every day cannot find good, affordable child care. Because they have to work or because they want to get out from under the welfare system, and the enrollment in our own state's welfare reform program provides testimony to this desire, they must make do with arrangements that are, at best, often unreliable and, at worst, unhealthy, like the one we learned about last week at a focus group when one infant was in care with 20 children and a single caregiver, or the one in which two children under 2 died in a fire last fall in an unlicensed family day care home.

What can we do to address this problem? Among others, there are two significant steps we can take. First, we can expand the supply of good child care as a comprehensive federal legislative program or as part of a federal effort to reform the welfare system. Either way, we must ensure that quality, affordable care provided by trained caregivers is available for parents who need it.

We believe that parents should have the opportunity to choose from a broad range of options, but under current circumstances their choices are limited—limited by shortages of good care, by cost, and by current policy.

Funding to expand the supply of care alone, however, will not do the job. Research shows that trained staff are a key factor in good child care programs, but the shortage of trained caregivers is severe. This situation has serious implications for the child care of infants and toddlers. One-year-olds are not just short 6-year-olds. They need child care providers who know how to care for them and can meet their special needs.

We know that training contributes to the quality of care, and we know that training serves as an incentive for new caregivers to enter the field. Our own program to expand the supply of family day care providers and to recreate the old pipeline that was decimated when the Title XX training funding was eliminated proves that there is a strong interest in this area.

We propose, therefore, that any new monies for the expansion of child care should include funds for the training and professional development of caregivers. This funding should be allocated for both pre-service and in-service training for those who care for infants and toddlers as well as those who care for older children.

Together with other incentives that Dr. Zigler has mentioned, such as scholarships and forgiveness loans for those who want to enter child care and early childhood education, these funds will go far towards expanding the supply of trained caregivers our children need.

We cannot, in good conscience, tolerate the current child care situation in this country when 9 in 10 babies in New York City may be in questionable child care arrangements. However generous, our city, our State, our private sector cannot solve this problem alone. We look to you for federal support.

[The prepared statement of Ms. Porter with an attachment, follows:]

CHILD CARE, INC.
275 Seventh Avenue · New York, N.Y. 10001 Telephone (212) 929-7604

TESTIMONY OF TONI PORTER

DIRECTOR OF RESEARCH AND PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT

CHILD CARE, INC.

Senate Subcommittee on Children, Families
Drugs, and Alcoholism

June 11, 1987

Good morning, Senator Dodd, members of the Subcommittee. My name is Toni Porter. I am the Director of Research and Program Development of Child Care, Inc. On behalf of Tony Ward and Nancy Kolben, as well as the other members of our staff, I want to thank you for inviting us to testify on child care, a subject vital to the well-being of families across the nation.

Child Care, Inc. is a private, non-profit child care resource and referral agency in New York City. Like other child care resource and referral agencies, we provide three primary services to our community--information and advice to parents who need child care; technical assistance to new and existing child care programs; and public education and advocacy on child care issues for parents and providers alike. We are one of the oldest CCRRs in the nation. We speak from 12 years of experience working with parents, working with child care programs, and working with our elected officials in New York City and Albany.

You already know about the expanding demand for child care in the United States--the increasing numbers of women in the workforce who have children, the growing numbers of single parent families, the rise in the number of poor children.

Let me give you a few statistics about my city, the Big Apple. In New York City, there are more than 300,000 children under 14 who need out

of home care while their parents work. Close to half of these children are under six. There are licensed full-day child care slots for less than a third of them. For low-income families or those at risk of break-up, the situation is worse: only one in five eligible children can be served in subsidized full-day programs.

There seems to be a pervasive notion in this country that families--especially low-income families can make do with "informal" child care arrangements. An expert at a conference on welfare reform in our city recently made just such a statement. Yet, evidence from our own Information Service points to the contrary. Families call us when the sister they had counted on to care for their three-month-old takes a job; when the grandmother who has taken care of their nine-month-old becomes seriously ill; when their neighbor moves and they no longer have care for their sixteen-month old toddler. These families are not making do. They are doing without.

Last year, we received calls from more than 4,000 parents who needed child care. Close to half of the requests were for care for infants and toddlers under two. Approximately one-third were for full-day care. And one in every two calls was from a parent who was eligible for publicly subsidized child care.

Who are the parents of these babies? They are the two-earner families who cannot afford the $200 to $300 a week cost for an in-home caregiver

and who want good, safe care for their infants. They are the single-parent families who need child care while they support their households and who need a stable, consistent child care arrangement. And they are the young mothers who need child care to enroll in job training or welfare to work programs and who want the advantages good child care offers for their children.

Our counselors try to help these families. They give them advice about choosing appropriate child care to meet their children's needs. And they give them information about child care in the 2,000 programs listed in our data bank.

But the shortage of child care for infants and toddlers in New York City is extreme. We estimate that there are 68,000 very young children who need out-of-home care while their parents work. Yet, all told, there are approximately 5,000 spaces for children under two in all of the programs--public and private--in our city. This means that only 7% of our very youngest children can be accomodated in programs that meet government standards.

As a result, thousands of parents every day cannot find good, affordable child care. Because they have to work or because they want to get out from under the welfare system (and the enrollment in our new state demonstration welfare to work programs is testimony to this desire), they must make do with arrangements that are at best, often unreliable, and, at worst, unhealthy--like the one we learned about in a focus group

last week where an infant was in care with twenty other children and a single caregiver.

What can we do to address this problem? Among others, there are two significant steps we can take. First, we can expand the supply of good child care as a consolidated program or as part of an effort to reform the welfare system. Good child care means that a child will be in a safe, healthy environment. It means developmentally appropriate care that meets the child's social, emotional, and cognitive needs. And it means stable, consistent arrangements that free parents from stress and worry.

Federal funding is needed to ensure that families who are working and those who want to work can find quality affordable care. This makes good sense for children, for families, and for the public purse that will benefit from the increased tax dollars.

Funding to expand the supply of care, however, will not do the job alone. Research shows that trained staff are a key factor in good child care programs. The shortage of trained caregivers in New York City and across the country is severe.

This situation has serious implications for the child care of infants and toddlers. One-year-olds are not short six-year-olds. They need child care providers who know how to care for them and can meet their very special needs.

We know that training contributes to the quality of care. We also know that training serves as an incentive for new caregivers to enter the field. Child Care, Inc.'s family day care expansion program, the Neighborhood Child Care Initiatives Project, funded by American Express, the Carnegie Corporation, and other private funders, has recruited close to 100 new family day care providers in the last year--largely because they sought the training courses we offer. Our Technical Assistance workshops on caring for infants and toddlers, moreover, are always oversubscribed. And our new program to recruit and train day care staff at centers by linking them with local colleges has been met with enthusiasm and excitement around the city.

We propose, therefore, that any new monies for the expansion of child care should include funds for the training of caregivers. This funding should be allocated for both pre-service and in-service training, for those who care for infants and toddlers as well as those who care for older children. Together with other financial incentives such as salary increases and opportunities for professional development, these funds will go far towards ensuring that we have the pool of trained caregivers our children deserve.

We cannot in good conscience tolerate the current child care situation in this country--when nine in ten babies in New York City may be in questionable child care arrangements. However generous, our city, our state, our private sector, cannot solve this problem alone. We look to you for federal support.

I will be happy to answer your questions.

Thank you.

SUPPLY AND DEMAND FOR FULL-DAY CARE FOR THE CHILDREN OF WORKING PARENTS BY AGE, 1986

Children	Supply[(a)]	Demand[(b)]	% Served
TOTAL: 0-13	69,051	306,799	22.5
6-13	25,196	162,431	15.5
< 6	43,855	144,368	30.4
3 - 5	38,795	76,636	50.6
0 - 2	5,060	67,732	7.4

(a) Based on CCI calculations of full-day care in both public and private programs for infants and toddlers; full-day care in public and private programs for pre-schoolers; and part-day programs for school-age children.

(b) Based on the New York State Council on Children and Families' 1980 Analysis of Children Potentially in Need of Substitute Out-of Home Care, modified by increases in labor force participation of mothers with children in specific age groups.

Source: CCI Unpublished data on the supply of full-day care; and New York State Council on Children and Families' Analysis of Children Potentially in Need of Substitute Care by Age and Ethnicity, New York City, 1980; and Hayghe, Howard, "Rise in Mothers' Labor Force Activity Including Those with Infants," Monthly Labor Review, U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, February 1986.

ESTIMATES OF CHILDREN ELIGIBLE FOR PUBLIC CHILD CARE SERVICES FOR FINANCIAL AND SOCIAL REASONS, 1986

Children	Publicly Funded Slots[a]	In Need[b]	% Served
TOTAL: 0-12	40,818	352,000	11.5
6-12	10,316	208,000	4.9
< 6	30,502	144,000	21.2
3 - 5	26,080	72,000	36.2
0 - 2	4,422	72,000	6.1

(a) Based on publicly funded full-day slots in ACD programs for infants and toddlers and pre-schoolers, as well as ACD school-age child care programs; does not include Head Start, Project Giant Step, or unallocated voucher slots.

(b) Based on HRA calculations for children who are financially and socially eligible for public child care services, including families at risk; recipients of AFDC who are working, enrolled in an approved vocational or educational program, or looking for work; those who are under 21 who are completing their high school education; ill or incapacitated; and income-eligible families who are working, or looking for work.

PERCENTAGE OF PUBLIC ASSISTANCE (PA) HOUSEHOLDS WITH CHILDREN UNDER 6[1]
December, 1984 and June, 1985

	December '84		June '85	
	#	%	#	%
All Households	NA	—	2,925,000	—
All PA Households	362,572	100.0	368,768	100.0
All PA Households with Children 18 and Under	243,265	67.1	243,733	66.1
All PA Households with Children Under 6	71,763	19.7	66,575	18.1
	Number of Children on Public Assistance[1]			
Total Children[2]	494,379	100.0	487,957	100.0
Under 6	191,403	38.7	177,973	36.5

1 PA includes ADC, ADC-U, HR, HR Adults, HR Families

2 Children includes 0-18 and 18 years of age

Source: Dependency, Economic and Social Data for New York City, Office of Policy and Economic Research, HRA, Summer 1985 and June 1985

ACD Public Expenditures for Child Care, 1982 and 1986[a]
(in millions)

	1982	1986	% Change
Total	$ 154.8	$ 201.7	+30.3%
Federal	115.3	122.8	+6.5%
State	-	8.8	100.0%
City	39.5	70.1	77.4%

(a) does not include $26.6 million in 1982 and $33.9 million in 1986 for Head Start

Sources: HRA Consolidated Services Plan, FFY 1982-1984 for Planned Expenditures for FY 1982; and HRA Consolidated Services Plan, FY 1986 for Planned Expenditures for 1986.

ACD Total Public Expenditures and Caseloads for
Head Start and Day Care Services
1982 and 1986

Expenditures

($'s in millions)

	1982	1986	%Change
Total	$ 181.4	$ 235.6	+ 29.8 %
Day Care	154.8	201.7	+ 30.3
Head Start	26.6	33.9	+ 27.4

(a)
Caseloads

Total	77,800	81,900	5.3%
Day Care	69,000	70,300	+ 1.9
Head Start	8,800	11,600	+ 31.8

(a)

includes all children served during the year.

Sources: HRA Consolidated Services Plan, FFY 1982-1984 for FY 1982;
HRA Consolidated Services Plan, FY 86 for FY 1986

Neighborhood Child Care Initiatives
275 Seventh Avenue New York, N.Y. 10001 212 • 929 • 7604
A Project of Child Care, Inc.

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE

CITY-WIDE PROJECT TO ADDRESS
CRISIS IN INFANT/TODDLER CARE

-- Project will expand supply of licensed family day care --

-- Funding provided by coalition of
New York corporations and foundations --

NEW YORK, N.Y., October 9, 1986, -- Child Care, Inc. and American Express Company today announced that they have established the Neighborhood Child Care Initiatives Project, a citywide program designed to expand child care services for working parents. The project is supported by contributions from American Express Company, the Carnegie Corporation of New York, Con Edison, Coopers & Lybrand, The Chase Manhattan Bank, R.H. Macy & Co., Manufacturers Hanover Trust Company, the New York Foundation and Willkie Farr & Gallagher. Their funding, totalling $395,000, represents the largest private commitment to child care in New York City this year.

The Neighborhood Child Care Initiatives Project will support four neighborhood networks of family day care providers and work with two existing networks previously established with funding from American Express. Each of the new networks will be sponsored by a community-based organization and will help providers obtain licensing, offer training and support and refer parents to providers.

In New York City, 150,000 children under the age of three have working mothers. With only 22 licensed full-day infant/toddler programs in New York City, and in-home care too expensive for many working parents, care for these infants and toddlers is in extremely short supply. Family day care, provided in the caregiver's home, is the only child care option open to a large number of working parents who have children in this youngest age group. However, only 117 family day care providers serving working parents are currently certified by the City.

- Brooklyn, Queens, Manhattan, the Bronx to be served --

The networks will offer care in central Brooklyn; Kingsbridge in the Bronx; Flushing and Rego Park in Queens; Tribeca in Manhattan; Park Slope, Bensonhurst and Bay Ridge in Brooklyn (areas already served by the Child Care Network); and Fort Greene, Crown Heights and Flatbush in Brooklyn (areas already served by the Cuddle Network).

"The networks will serve as models for expansion of family day care throughout the city," said Antony Ward, Director of Child Care, Inc. "This cooperative venture of corporate and private philanthropy sets an important precedent for future efforts to meet the demand for high quality child care."

"Parents' concern over the quality and reliability of child care has a direct impact on employers' ability to hire and retain a productive workforce," stated Dee Topol, Vice President of the American Express Foundation. "The Neighborhood Child Care Initiatives Project will take significant steps toward addressing the child care needs of New York City's working parents."

-more-

-- Networks to recruit and train providers, market services and monitor quality of care --

The Project will seek sponsors among local social service agencies, recreation programs, schools, churches, synagogues and other community organizations. Child Care, Inc. will provide resources and support services for all of the Neighborhood Child Care Initiatives networks, including publicity materials to recruit providers and attract parents; workshops to train family day care providers; a training guide for the networks; a quarterly newsletter for network staff, with information on such topics as fundraising and marketing; bimonthly meetings of network staff; and assistance in contracting for U.S.D.A. funding for meals, obtaining liability insurance and buying toys and equipment at a discount.

Child Care, Inc. is a non-profit organization dedicated to increasing the supply, quality and affordability of child care in New York City.

American Express Company's Philanthropic Program supports a variety of community-based child care initiatives for working parents across the U.S. Its funding is provided by American Express Travel Related Services Company, Shearson Lehman Brothers, IDS Financial Services and American Express Bank Ltd.

# # #

Contact: Toni Porter
Child Care, Inc.
(212) 929-7604

Mary Cason
American Express
(212) 640-5594

Senator DODD. Thank you very much, Toni, for your comments. We will have some questions for you in a moment, but we first will hear from Nancy Travis.

Nancy, again, I would advise you to bring that microphone up. The acoustics in these rooms are not always good. While Senator Mikulski and I can hear you pretty well, those behind you have a little more difficulty in picking up what you are saying.

Ms. TRAVIS. Well, as Senator Dodd pointed out, I have been doing child care for a very long time, and sometimes people ask me, you know, how do I hang in; am I not discouraged. But I tend to be sort of an optimist and I think some very good things are happening that are fairly new in the whole scheme of things.

One of the very important things, I think, is the resource and referral service. It not only provides that one-stop service that Senator Mikulski referred to, but it also provides sort of a framework that allows us to begin to put together all of the pieces we need in this big jigsaw called child care.

The resource and referral services for the first time have really enabled us to hear what parents want and need, and to document that. You know, that has always been sort of the unknown. You know, we as professionals have made some assumptions about what parents want and need. So it has brought the parents in.

It has also brought family day care into much higher focus. For a long time, I, like a lot of other child care people, felt that family day care would go away when we once got enough good day care centers. We certainly know that this is not the case. It is a true form of care, the form of care of preference for many families, especially those with infants and toddlers. For the first time, we are in the position of needing those family day care providers as much as we feel that they also need us.

It has also brought the employers into the picture. In our particular situation, we have contracts with eight companies, and hopefully we will have some more before too long. The participation of these companies not only allows us to help their employees, but their participation in the community-wide line helps to pick up some of those costs that, you know, we find difficult to totally meet, at least in our area.

In addition to what they are doing for their own employees, two companies have been particularly generous to us in money for resource development. One of the things that we are faced with is finding enough good child care out there to meet the needs of the parents that call us, and we have been very active in this arena of resource development.

Last year, we did 15 different workshops on becoming a family day care provider, you know, both from the business aspect and the child development aspect. We have now been working closely with our cooperative extension people and they are picking up this kind of training and are doing it in other parts of the State. We also do it cooperatively with the YM in some instances.

We do quarterly workshops on starting a day care center, which is a mechanism for helping people get in and also for screening some out, I might say, who, you know, see dollar signs at the end of the road and do not realize exactly what is involved.

We have just gotten a small grant to have a person to work specifically with churches. We need more of the non-profit child care in our area, and right now we are talking to about 16 different churches in our area and that is partly because of the money from the employers.

We also have in Atlanta some employer-related child care centers and they have been very important to us in providing some models of what good child care can look like. Unfortunately, they do not begin to meet the needs of the lower-income families.

I noticed in the Paramount situation they have a scholarship fund, and that is certainly very important. We do not have that and we, for instance, had a call from an employee of one of the companies that contributes to a consortium child care center.

You know, we asked if she knew about it and she said, yes, but I am a secretary and I am a single parent and I have two children and there is no way I can afford that particular service.

So, you know, while it is an important contribution to the overall child care picture, I think that we have to remember that it is not going to pick up the whole burden by any means, and it does tend to help the people in management positions, who are also the people who benefit from the salary redirection plans and from the child care tax.

I want to say a little bit about family day care. We have worked with it for a long time. We have a child care food umbrella that reimburses 1,000 family day care providers in 68 counties every month for the food that is served.

We do a rural subsidized child care program using a system of family day care homes. We have another 500 family day care homes, and there is some overlap with the food program, who participate in the referral service.

We offer ongoing training of different types, the nutrition training that goes with the food program, as well as other forms of care. We have also recruited our cooperative extension folks to join us in the effort to do family day care training, and this is helping our picture a lot.

I really commend Senator Dodd's bill and I hope that that will move along. It is a very important step, I think, in our whole child care thing. We must keep the child care food program intact. It is the single most important thing that has brought family day care out from underground, that gets them into training, that gets them into the mainstream.

It has also been the important factor in getting States to take the responsibility for regulating because to be in the food program, you have to be regulated, and many States that administratively decided not to bother with family day care even if their law mandated it have been forced by the advocates to get into the regulatory process.

Just finally, I want to speak for the need for some federal involvement. Unfortunately, when everything is left to the States, some States seem to do better than others. We need a lot more help in our State, and I think in our part of the country.

In Georgia, we have only 8,000 subsidized slots in 87 of our 159 counties. In the whole State, there are fewer than 300 infant slots

that are subsidized, and yet we are fourth highest in the adolescent pregnancy rate.

None of our Title XX or social service block grant day care serves anything but the 9-to-5 or the 6-to-6 needs, except for the two family day care systems, one of which we operate, and we put up the match for both of them.

Last year, our money going into our system was cut by 36 percent. No slots were cut, but the cuts were made up by decreasing the child-staff ratio. We are one of three States that has higher than a 1-to-6 ratio for infants. We join North and South Carolina in that distinction. So we do support some continuation of the federal role.

Thank you very much.

[The prepared statement of Ms. Travis follows:]

STATEMENT OF NANCY TRAVIS

TESTIMONY PRESENTED TO SENATE COMMITTEE ON LABOR AN HUMAN RESOURCES

June 11, 1987

My name is Nancy Travis and I am the Director of the Southern States Office of Save the Children. Save the Children is a community development agency that began in 1932. Save the Children works internationally and in the United States. Currently we work in 44 countries. Our programs in the United States includes work on many Indian reservations, in Appalachia, in the Mississippi Delta, in the Southwest, and in three inner-city areas (New York, Dallas and Bridgeport, Connecticut).

The Southern States Office is located in Atlanta, Georgia and operates community development programs in Virginia, South Carolina, and Georgia. Our mission is to assist low income, mostly rural communities to develop self-help programs to meet needs as identified by the community. We have 14 such programs across the South. The Southern States Office also has a special mission to look at the issue of child care for working parents and demonstrate ways that quality child care can be made available and affordable. Because of this mission, we have developed several different kinds of support services to working parents and to child care providers. Although our primary concern is the needs of low income families, we have worked with parents of all income levels and know that finding and maintaining a good

81-972 0 - 88 - 3

child care arrangement presents serious difficulties for most families.

CHILD CARE RESOURCE AND REFERRAL SERVICE

One of the programs we established is Child Care Solutions. Child Care Solutions is a child care resource and referral service. It offers free child care referral to working parents in Metropolitan Atlanta. Parents who call Solutions receive counseling about their options and information about how to select and maintain a child care arrangement in a day care center or a family day care home. Parents are given at least three referrals that come close to meeting their requirements. If these referrals do not work out, they can receive additional referrals. Parental response to Solutions has been tremendous. During 1987, over 7,500 parents called Solutions seeking help finding child care.

Solutions is acutely aware of unmet child care needs in Atlanta and works hard to increase the quantity and quality of child care. In the last year we offered 17 sessions on How to Start a Family Day Care Home. These were offered by our staff, often in collaboration with Cooperative Extention or the YWCA. We also offer at least one How to Start A Day Care Center workshops each quarter. In addition to this, we offer a wide variety of other training opportunities open to all day care providers.

In addition to our free community-wide referral, we also have an enhanced service for corporations who contract with us. For these clients we have a separate corporate line (the community lines are very busy and difficult to access), and in some cases we confirm vacancies, do frequent follow-ups, and make reports according to the terms of our contract. Corporations we are currently serving include: C & S Nat'l. Bank; IBM; National Cash Register; Allstate Insurance; Herman Miller; North Lake Foods; and Shared Medical Personnel. As of July, we will begin serving employees of American Express and Pitney Bowes.

ASSISTANCE TO LOW INCOME PARENTS

The Southern States Office has developed several initiatives to help low income parents afford child care. When the Job Training and Partnership Act was first implemented in 1983, we encouraged each of the Private Industry Councils serving Atlanta to include child care as a support service for job trainees. Subsequently, we developed contracts with two Private Industry Councils to provide referral and to pay for child care for participants in their program. Other contracts we have developed help pay for child care for refugees and for emergency child care during times of family crisis. Through these efforts, we payed for child care for over 500 children last year.

RECOGNITION AND SUPPORT TO FAMILY DAY CARE

Family day care is the care of six or fewer children in the home of the provider. This is a very popular child care option among parents, but family day care has seldom received public recognition or support. Consequently, very few communities have developed mechanisms to encourage women to become family day care providers or to upgrade the quality of services they offer to children. The Southern States Office has been a leader in the effort to strengthen and support family day care. We have worked extensively with family day care providers and with community groups interested in supporting family day care. Our work with family day care has included both urban and rural areas.

One of our efforts in support of family day care is the Child Care Food Program. This program uses U.S.D.A. funds to reimburse providers for meals they serve to children in their care. Providers who participate in this program must meet state licensing laws, they must serve nutritionally adequate meals, must attend nutrition training and must agree to be visited three times a year. Currently we are serving 1,000 providers in 68 Georgia counties.

Another one of our activities is a supervised system of family day care homes serving a two-county rural area. This uses Social Service Block Grant funds to purchase child care for low income children. Providers who participate in this program receive child development training and are visited

regularly by a Child Development Specialist. They are also able to borrow toys and equipment from a toy lending library.

The Southern States Office has been involved with family day care for many years, and is constantly sharing information about this form of care with other communities.

In April 1987 we sponsored our tenth annual conference on family day care. The 1987 conference included over 650 participants from approximately 45 states. We have also just completed two new publications on this topic: Family Day Care: An Option for Rural Communities and The Child Care Food Program For Family Day Care: A How To Manual.

Based on our local experiences, I want to address three of the many possible issues: The Role of the Corporate Sector; The Need for a Federal Presence in the States; and The Importance of Family Day Care As A Part of the Delivery System.

EMPLOYER SUPPORTED CHILD CARE

This is a very important part of the child care system and the fact that we have 8 corporate clients helps to make possible the community resource and referral line that serve all families in that it pays for a certain proportion of our costs such as phones, space, advertising, and resource development. Some of our clients, especially I B M and Mervyn's have provided special funding to increase the supply of child care especially family day care. Mervyn's does not contract for their own employees, but they have

given us a two-year contract to recruit and train family day care providers in some of the outlying counties of Metropolitan Atlanta. This kind of initiative helps everybody seeking child care.

In Metropolitan Atlanta there are six hospital day care centers, one on-site center sponsored by a bank, and a downtown consortium that was started by four major businesses. The consortium center serves 100 children. Each company has 20 spaces and there are 20 spaces available to the community. It is excellent day care, but it costs $85 a week. for infants and $60 for children three to five years of age. As one parent in a clerical position put it, "as a single parent with two kids, there is no way I can afford it."

There are more employer initiatives on the drawing board and they are a very important addition to the available supply of child care. In many cases they provide models of quality care, but again, they tend to serve the people in management positions who also are able to benefit from the tax credit and in some cases, salary redirection plans. We do have one client that contracts with us to voucher 25% of their employee's child care. Many of these families would be eligible for subsidized child care if it were available.

I see no evidence that we can count on the corporate world to take on child care for low income families.

NEED FOR FEDERAL INVOLVEMENT FOR CHILD CARE TO SERVE LOW INCOME FAMILIES

There continues to be a need for federal funding and some federal control. Without that many states will not maintain current efforts as new funding comes along. In Georgia we have 8,000 subsidized slots in 87 of our 159 counties. This is the same number that we have had for many years. Less than 300 slots are available statewide for infant care, and yet we are fourth in the nation in the number of teenage pregnancies. None of these programs, with the exception of two rural family day care networks, are open beyond the traditional 6 am to 6 pm so that many low income families who work other than these hours are not helped.

In FY-87 the budget for subsidized child care was cut by 36%. The same number of spaces were provided, but the cuts were made possible by a reduction in the staff/child ratios. The funds that were taken from the "slot purchase program" were not used to create additional slots for that program.

We are in the process of moving from totally contracted centers to a Slot Purchase Plan. Now in the second year of transition. We are still only purchasing from the original contracted centers.

The "working poor" are not being well served. The priorities for care are: 1) Protective Service, 2) Reuni-

fication, 3) AFDC Recipients, 4) Families in Employability programs, and 5) Working Poor.

Some base-line regulation maybe needed. For example, Georgia is one of three states (along with North Carolina and South Carolina) that have staff/child ratios greater than 1:6.

FAMILY DAY CARE

Family day care (usually thought of as the care of six or fewer children in a providers home) is often preferred by parents especially for very young children, and offers real possibility for affordability, accessably. We need supports to deal with the quality issue.

We strongly support Senate Bill 982 introduced by Senator Dodd for himself and Senator Cranston.

Critical to the whole family day care picture is the continuation of the Child Care Food Program for family day care in its present form without income eligibility. This has been the single most important factor in making family day care visible, and forcing states to play a role in regulation. Prior to the Food Program many states, even though regulation was mandated, elected to ignore the existance of family day care. At the present time only two states have no method of regulating any part of their family day care services. Participation in the Food Program and the training that goes along with it has done a great to enhance the self-concept of family day care providers

[Editor's note: The original page 9 of this statement was inadvertently lost and could not be reproduced for this document.]

choose.

We have also found that in rural areas where employment is relatively scare or where people do not have the transportation to access employment opportunities, family day care provides an important supplementary income. When training is available, providers learn certain business skills as well as child development skills which may be marketable at a later time.

There is a great need to continue to see family day care as a significant part of the child caring community, and to find ways to support it without over institutionalizing it. The issue of regulation is a critical one. There does need to be some basic protection for children, but it is important not to create barriers that will drive the family day care business underground. The ongoing education of parents as consumers that is part of a resource and referral system should be stressed.

PRESENTED BY:

Nancy E. Travis, Director
SAVE THE CHILDREN
Southern States Office
1340 Spring St., N.W., Suite 200
Atlanta, Georgia 30309

(404) 885-1578

Senator DODD. Thank you very much, Ms. Travis, and again we thank you for being here.

Is it Caro?

Ms. PEMBERTON. It is Caro.

Senator DODD. Caro?

Ms. PEMBERTON. Yes.

Senator DODD. Sorry.

Ms. PEMBERTON. Is this close enough?

Senator DODD. I can hear you. Just get a little closer if you can.

Ms. PEMBERTON. OK.

Senator DODD. There you go.

Ms. PEMBERTON. I have been asked today to talk on the issue of affordability in child care and am honored to have this opportunity.

In addressing the issue of affordability, I would like to draw your attention to the single greatest factor contributing to affordability in our current child care delivery system; that is, the hidden subsidy provided by the low wages paid to child care workers.

This subsidy not only has the greatest overall impact on the cost of child care but, unlike most subsidies, directly benefits families in every economic strata of our society. The 3 million women and men who work in child care centers and family day care homes underwrite the real cost of child care by working for poverty level wages and without benefits.

A recent study prepared by the National Committee on Pay Equity cited these teachers and providers as the second most underpaid workers in the nation. Incidentally, the first was clergy and, presumably, the TV evangelists were not included in that survey. [Laughter.]

In spite of an average education level of 14 years, current population surveys from the Bureau of Labor Statistics confirm that child care workers in schools and day care centers have a median annual income of $9,464, earnings that place them on par with dishwashers, parking lot attendants, and zoo keepers.

For workers who care for children in private households, the median annual income is even lower, about $4,732 annually. More than 70 percent of all child care workers have annual earnings that fall below the poverty level.

Child care staff are underpaid because child care programs do not have enough money to adequately compensate them. Child care programs must rely primarily on parent fees to support their budgets. Consequently, salaries and benefits, as the largest category in program budgets and often the only negotiable line item, are held down as a means of keeping parent fees affordable.

Because most families cannot afford to pay the real cost of child care, staff are expected to subsidize parent fees and accept salaries that are far below the value of the job they perform.

Sadly, we are beginning to understand the consequences of this form of subsidy. By relying on early childhood professionals to keep the cost of child care affordable, we are running the risk of exhausting a valuable national resource, a resource that is critical to the future education and development of our young children.

By asking the people who care for our children to accept a standard of living that the government defines as unacceptable, we have

made the early childhood profession an untenable career option for young people. Each day, we are also losing many of the trained and experienced teachers who are currently working in the field.

During a 12-month period from 1980 to 1981, the annual turnover rate for personnel in the child care field was 42 percent nationally, which is more than twice the average for all occupations.

More recent surveys of child care staff conducted by the Child Care Employee Project confirmed that in some communities the turnover rate is currently as high as 60 percent; that is, 6 out of 10 child care staff left their jobs this past year.

As the turnover rate climbs and demand for child care expands, we are finding that child care programs are having greater difficulty finding experienced teachers. Directors are spending inordinate amounts of time trying to locate and train qualified staff and teachers are suffering from increasing stress that stems from the additional workload required to orient one new coworker after another.

Unfortunately, there are those who will argue that the way to keep child care affordable and to respond to the shortage of child care teachers is to lower regulations and standards, standards that in some States are already frighteningly inadequate.

The argument put forth is that with lower qualifications and higher adult-to-child ratios, child care programs will be able to hire fewer providers and pay them less to care for the same numbers of children. Thus, the cost of child care will not be so expensive.

But can we afford to use low standards as a means of containing costs? We know that trained and experienced staff who have the ability to implement developmentally-appropriate curriculum are the single greatest determinant of quality in early childhood programs.

Moreover, years of research and experience reveal that children develop and learn far better when they are in child care programs that can provide consistent and reliable staff and small ratios of adults to children.

In raising the question of affordability, we must not only ask what parents can afford to pay, but we must also ask what will be the consequences for children if we continue to rely on teachers and providers to subsidize the cost of child care.

What will be the short- and long-term effect on the education and development of children if they are cared for in programs where there are insufficient numbers of adults and where the adults are not experienced and trained in early childhood development? Ultimately, what is the cost to our nation if this is all we are able to provide for children in the most formative years of their lives?

With the cost of child care in some regions of the country now as high as $4,000 to $6,000 per year for just one child, it is easy for us to see why high-quality child care is beyond the financial capabilities of most American families.

However, if we recognize the importance of giving our children the highest quality care and education in their earliest years, then we must preserve the valuable resource we have in the people who are providing the care.

We cannot continue to expect providers and teachers to subsidize the high cost of child care. We as a government and a society must accept that responsibility and seek to strike a balance between the needs of families for affordable, high-quality services and the needs of providers for fair and decent employment.

[The prepared statement of Ms. Pemberton follows:]

■ Child Care Employee Project

6536 Telegraph Avenue, Oakland, California, 415/653-9889
Mailing address: P.O. Box 5603, Berkeley, CA 94705

Testimony before the Senate Subcommittee on Children, Families, Drugs and Alchoholism
Hearings on Child Care
June 11, 1987

Senator Dodd and members of the Committee, I am honored to have this opportunity to speak to you today on the issue of affordability in child care.

In addressing the issue of affordability, I would like to draw your attention to the single greatest factor contributing to affordability in our current child care delivery system -- the hidden subsidy provided by the low wages paid to child care workers. This subsidy not only has the greatest overall impact on the cost of child care, but, unlike most subsidies, directly benefits families in every economic strata of our society. The three million women and men who work in child care centers and family day care homes underwrite the real cost of child care by working for poverty level wages and without benefits.

A recent study prepared by the National Committee on Pay Equity cited these teachers and providers as the second most underpaid workers in the nation.[1] In spite of an average education level of 14 years, current population surveys from the Bureau of Labor Statistics (1986) confirm that child care workers in schools and day care centers have a median annual income of $9,464, earnings that place them on par with dishwashers, parking lot attendants, and zookeepers. For workers who care for children in private households, the median annual income is even lower -- $4,732 annually. More than 70% of <u>all</u> child care workers have annual earnings that fall below the poverty level.[2]

Child care staff are underpaid because child care programs do not have enough money to adequately compensate them. Child care programs must rely primarily on parent fees to support their budgets. Consequently, salaries and benefits, as the largest category in program budgets and often the only "negotiable" line item, are held down as a means of keeping parent fees affordable. Because most families cannot afford to pay the real cost of child care, staff are expected to subsidize parent fees and accept salaries that are far below the value of the job they perform.

Sadly, we are beginning to understand the consequences of this form of subsidy. By relying on early childhood professionals to keep the cost of child care affordable, we are running the risk of exhausting a valuable national resource -- a resource that is critical to the future education and development of our young children. By asking the people who care for our children to accept a standard of living that the government defines as unacceptable, we have made the early childhood profession an untenable career option for young people. Each day we are losing many of the trained and experienced teachers currently working in the field.

During a 12-month period from 1980 to 1981, the annual turnover rate for personnel in the child care field was 42% nationally, more than twice the average for all occupations.[3] And more recent surveys of child care staff conducted by the Child Care Employee Project confirm that in some communities the turnover rate is currently as high as 60% (i.e. six out of ten child care staff members left their jobs this past year).[4]

As the turnover rate climbs and the demand for child care expands, we are finding that child care programs are having greater difficulty finding experienced teachers, directors are spending inordinate amounts of time trying to locate and train qualified staff, and teachers are suffering from increasing stress that stems from the additional workload required to orient one new co-worker after another.

Unfortunately, there are those who will argue that the way to keep child care affordable and to respond to the shortage of child care teachers is to lower regulations and standards -- standards that in some states are already frighteningly inadequate. The argument put forth is that with lower qualifications and higher adult-to-child ratios child care programs will be able to hire fewer providers and pay them less to care for the same numbers of children. Thus, the cost of child care will not be so expensive.

But, can we afford to use low standards as a means of containing costs? Trained and experienced staff who have the knowledge and ability to implement developmentally appropriate curriculum are the single greatest determinant of quality in early childhood programs. Moreover, years of research and experience reveal that children develop and learn far better when they are in child care programs that can provide consistent and reliable staff and small ratios of adults to children.[5]

In raising the question of affordability we must not only ask what parents can afford to pay, but we must also ask what will be the consequences for children if we continue to rely on teachers and providers to subsidize the cost of child care. What will be the short and long term effect on the education and development of children if they are cared for in programs where there are insufficient numbers of adults and where the adults are not experienced and trained in early childhood development. Ultimately, what is the cost to our nation if this is all we are able to provide for children in the most formative years of their lives?

With the cost of child care in some regions of the country now as high as $4 - 6,000/year for just one child, it is easy for us to see why high quality child care is beyond the financial capabilities of most American families. However, if we recognize the importance of giving our children the highest quality care and education in their

earliest years, then we must preserve the valuable resource we have in the people who are providing that care. We cannot continue to expect providers and teachers to subsidize the high cost of child care. We, as a government and a society, must accept that responsibility and seek to strike a balance between the needs of families for affordable, high quality services, and the needs of providers for fair and decent employment.

NOTES

[1] National Committee on Pay Equity (1987). Pay Equity, An Issue of Race, Ethnicity and Sex. Washington, D.C.

[2] National Association for the Education of Young Children (1986). In Whose Hands? A Demographic Fact Sheet About Child Care Providers. Washington, D.C.

[3] Whitebook, M. (1986). "The Teacher Shortage, A Professional Precipice." Young Children, 41, pp. 10-11.

[4] Child Care Employee Project (1987). Working with Young Children: Wages and Working Conditions in Southern Alameda County Programs. Oakland, Calif.

[5] Howes, C. (1986). Keeping Current in Child Care Research, An Annotated Bibliography. National Association for the Education of Young Children. Washington, D.C.

Senator DODD. Thank you very much, Caro, for the excellent testimony. That will be made a part of the record.

Dr. Zigler, let me begin with you, if I can. As you know, Doctor, I have introduced a family day care bill. Ms. Travis talked about it. I do not know if you have had a chance to take a look at it or not, but I would be anxious to hear your comments about it.

Dr. ZIGLER. I have browsed the bill and it is certainly a step in the right direction, Senator Dodd. Child care is a vast mosaic; it has to be disaggregated into pieces. The problem has gotten out of hand for our nation.

One important piece, and probably a very high-priority piece at that, is family day care because as I indicated to you before, it is that system where we get a really very heterogeneous quality of care.

The care you heard of here today was the very best. It is like a cosmic crap shoot for America's parents in that system. If you go out there and you are fortunate to get this wonderful person you heard today, you are home free, but that is very unusual. That is where the horror stories are as well. So we must move in the direction of upgrading that system.

I will give you just two warnings on your bill. First of all, somebody on this panel just used the term "system of family day care homes." The fact is that we workers in the field know how to do all of these things and they have not been implemented.

For instance, we have to somehow deisolate those homes. We have a wonderful model that was developed by Elizabeth Prescott and June Sala of Pacific Oaks where you take a number of these homes, have a hub, and that becomes the support system for these stressed and overworked parents. It can provide training and a variety of things.

So as you move forward on this very important bill, please look at what you can do to act as a catalyst for the development of systems of family day care around this country.

One final remark to show you how nonsensical the situation is in the United States today. I have been so concerned about family day care prior to your bill that I have tried to mobilize the private sector to see if we could not, on our own, upgrade the quality of family day care everywhere in this nation.

We are developing models to do that using television, a variety of teaching materials. I have enlisted the collaboration of the National Council of Jewish Women and the black negro women's organization. They will all work and donate their services, which amounts to millions of dollars.

So I have been going around with a tin cup to foundations asking for $200,000 so I can mobilize this entire system to change all of family day care in America. I may or may not get it, but I cannot help but wonder as an ex-government official where is the federal government at least to provide some incentives and this kind of seed money that allows the private sector that it has always championed to really do its thing.

Senator DODD. Good point. With the passage of the tax bill a year or so ago, we took away all the incentives. These are things people are going to do on their own. I talked to the people who voted against that tax bill. I am not sure it did what everyone thought it

was going to do. Time will tell. I think we will have to get back to exactly what you are talking about, and sooner rather than later.

One of the difficulties I have had, Doctor, is that some people, well-intentioned people, say the parented leave issue really can be taken care of with child care. We will be holding hearings on parental leave in Boston shortly.

I wonder if you might just spend a couple minutes and explain—I apparently have no success at this—the difference between parental leave and child care.

Dr. ZIGLER. It can be done in 1 minute. The fact is you cannot capture the child care problem in America whole. As I said a moment ago, you must disaggregate it into pieces and ages of the child.

It happens that at that point of birth, there is a very stressful, critical period in the life of the family and the child that requires a child care leave, as every other country provides. But that does absolutely nothing for the problems we have all been here discussing.

We did a survey of 200 mothers and said what do you want. They would like a child care leave of about 3½ or 4 months, then they would like to go back to work because most of them really have to.

So at that point in time, the problem is not a parental care leave. At that point in time, it is where do I get this very rare infant care leave, and then it goes on through the years until you are up to the school-age child.

So I am a strong proponent of your infant care leave bill because it at least takes care of a piece of this jigsaw puzzle and an attempt to disassemble it and to circumscribe doable things, because as I said before, if you try to tackle child care problems as a totality, you simply throw up your hands.

Senator DODD. What is the status, by the way, of research? I know there has been a great deal of discussion lately on the effects of infant care. Some say there is a magic age of entry in these various programs.

All of us get a bit confused by this research that is being done. We really have not pulled it all together, so, what is the status of research with regard to infant care?

Dr. ZIGLER. Well, you are now touching upon the hottest debate going on among child development experts in the United States, which is namely the developmental effects on children of being placed in out-of-home care in the first year of life, only the first year of life.

This debate will go on. Please do not wait for this debate to be resolved. We psychologists make our living debating with each other and filling up our journals. The fact is we have one very distinguished and very credible worker in this country, Professor Belsky at Penn State, who has presented evidence that indicates that there very well may be some negative effects of very early out-of-home care.

On the opposing team, we have individuals who look at the same data and point out that the measure that he is using which is indicative of damaging the child is a very narrow measure.

Senator DODD. I might add, I was on a panel with Professor Belsky at Harvard a few weeks back and my sense of listening to him is a bit different than the press releases on him.

I am not so sure he is quite as far out as I thought he might have been when I sat down and talked with him.

Dr. ZIGLER. He is not. He is a perfectly sound worker and he says the same thing. Let us not concentrate on where developmentalists will fight for the next 15 years. Let us concentrate on the consensus.

What Jay Belsky and his opponents underscore—and I am a player in that debate—all of them have said, look, if that is where there may be a problem, that is where we have to be particularly conscious of good quality care; namely, for infants.

That is why your family day care bill is so important, Senator Dodd, because it turns out that 70 percent of the infants in the country that we are arguing about are not in centers; they are in family day care settings.

Senator DODD. Toni, your statistics about New York are staggering. Just a fractional percentage of the 68,000 children who need licensed child care are getting it. What is the status of family day care in New York City?

Ms. PORTER. We have a major problem with the shortage of family day care in New York City. As I mentioned earlier, there are only about 120 homes that are regulated outside of the subsidized system for all the children who cannot gain access to the publicly-funded system.

In New York City, as Dr. Zigler suggested, most of the infants and toddlers are cared for in family day care homes. Of those 5,000 places I mentioned, we have a total of 800 in group centers for infants. So the remainder of care for infants and toddlers is in family day care homes.

We at Child Care, Inc., have a project to recruit family day care providers, and what we have found, contrary to what you indicated, is that not the child care feeding program, but training is the primary incentive for recruiting new providers.

We have brought in more than 100 providers in the last year alone because they wanted to take our training courses. So I think when we talk about training being a factor in the quality of care, we should also talk about it as an incentive for recruiting people to enter the child care field, and that goes beyond family day care into other early childhood programs as well.

Senator DODD. Let me ask you about something that Caro raised. Maybe the answer is self-evident, but we draw the conclusion and, in a sense, you did too with your prepared testimony, Caro, that people who are paying $4,000 to $6,000 a year for child care are getting quality care. Implicit in your comment there, Caro, is that a person is getting quality child care because they are paying $4,000 to $6,000 for it.

Has anyone bothered to look at whether or not that is the case? I can imagine if you put a child care center in a certain section of New York City on Central Park South or on Fifth Avenue or on the West Side, and it is the right setting and it has the right address, and they charge the right amount, there is an immediate assumption that people adopt that they are getting the best care for their children.

I just wonder if there have been any judgments made or any assessments made about the link between price and quality in New

York. I do not know. I thought of New York when you raised it because I can assume that Caro's statistics—probably a lot of them come out of that New York setting.

Ms. PORTER. I am sure you, Caro, know more about the research than I do on this end, but I can tell you that I do not think that the dollar that is paid is necessarily equivalent to the kind of care you receive. I think what is probably a more relevant factor is the training and the qualifications of the caregiver.

Senator DODD. Yes.

Ms. PORTER. Now, in New York City what we find is that the providers can charge what the market will bear.

Senator DODD. Yes.

Ms. PORTER. We have very little, by the way, proprietary care in New York City because our standards are so high that it becomes exorbitant for profit providers to provide care in New York City. Most of our care is not-for-profits.

But we do have a tremendous range in fees. That is largely because we have a tremendous range in what people can pay. In some communities for example, family day care, which is cheaper than in-home care provided by a nanny, ranges as high as $200 a week, which is the equivalent of center care. In other places, it is $40 a week, depending on what they can pay.

Senator DODD. Do you want to jump in on that?

Ms. PEMBERTON. Yes. I think the pertinent comment here is that I think that there is indeed a great range in terms of quality that does not necessarily have anything to do with cost.

What surveys that we have done have indicated, however, is that with higher-cost care, teachers and providers are making more money, which enables centers to attract higher qualified staff, and indeed that the turnover decreases considerably. The more money teachers and providers make, the lower the turnover.

With training and consistency being key to quality, we can assume there is some relationship there.

Senator DODD. Ms. Travis, Senator Mikulski—as you heard me say at the outset if you were here when I made my opening statement—really is responsible more than anyone else for the resource and referral programs. I will let her address the questions more specifically to you.

But I am curious as to whom you are serving with those particular efforts in the Southern States.

Ms. TRAVIS. Last year, we provided referrals for 8,800 children; 46 percent of those were for children under a year, another 23 percent were for children 1 to 2 years and 11 months. About 12 percent were for school-age children.

I have some figures here somewhere that were for care other than the traditional daytime hours, and it is people from all segments. It is people that can afford to pay and it is also teenage kids that want to go back to school and cannot find child care.

Without subsidies, there is not a lot that we can do for them sometimes, but we are able sometimes to connect them up with family day care. You know, women that care about people and kids are subsidizing child care in this country in some other ways, too.

You know, we find family day care providers that will take a child when there is a real need for such a small amount that it is

almost a contribution. It is kind of amazing, but it sometimes happens.

Senator DODD. Caro, I found your testimony to be excellent. The 42-percent turnover rate is mind-boggling. It is up to 60 percent in some areas. Going back to some of the earlier testimony we had about the importance in those settings that there be some consistency for children, it obviously is just absent. I mean, the care is not consistent at all if those numbers are the case.

Salaries are obviously important, but you heard Toni talk about regulation as being important and that can also raise cost. But I agree with your conclusion that the alternative of unregulated care is certainly not something we want to opt for.

So what is your notion here? I mean, we are getting beyond the point of the poverty level or the low-income woman not being able to afford child care. When you start talking about the regulation, salary level and training that will make child care an attractive job opportunity for younger people, it seems to me we may be outpricing families beyond the low-income level. We are reaching up into middle-income families in this country and their inability to pay for all this.

Do you have any thoughts at all on how you deal with this beyond a subsidy approach?

Ms. PEMBERTON. Well, I think that, you know, as I said in my conclusion that I think this is a responsibility that we need to accept as a society, and that families do need assistance in paying for the cost of child care and that that needs to come from a combination of public support and employer support.

I think, you know, certainly, as with health care, which we are beginning to understand the responsibility of as a society, I think that child care is another area that both the government and employers need to accept a responsibility for.

Senator DODD. Do any of you want to comment on that? Ed, did you want to comment?

Dr. ZIGLER. Yes. It is a question that I have been wrestling with for 30 years now, Senator Dodd. What should be done in this country has been clear for a long time. First, you start with the standards. Standards by themselves are meaningless.

What you then do with the standards is what I did here in Washington, cost them out. Exactly what do these standards mean in terms of cost? Appreciate that the costs that we are talking about in this country are in the $75 to $100 billion range. You are talking very large money.

Now, once you have those costs in hand, then the issue becomes how do you make sure that parents have this money. Of course, that has been the problem. There are only two ways to go that I can say nationwide.

One, interestingly enough, was recommended by a conservative Senator who chaired this committee prior to you, Senator Dodd. Senator Paula Hawkins, of Florida, was talking to this country about a negative income tax. That may be one way to go.

I have examined the negative income tax and it has a great number of problems. How do you guarantee that the cost is really spent for the care we want? It becomes very governmentally intrusive. So I have a bend in that in my own thinking.

We need a structural change in the United States to deal with this tremendous demographic revolution that we have witnessed in 25 years. What I see happening, and I will predict the future for you—many of you will be here and I probably will not be—and that is we will change the American school.

We will allow children to come to school at the age of three not for formal schooling, which could be destructive for children, but for good child care. They will have this system, if parents need it, for the years 3 and 4 and half a day at 5. Then we will have before and after-school care in those buildings in the neighborhood.

I really do believe that child care, like education, should be a State initiative, with the federal government doing its particular thing. Probably the cost is so great, being concerned about what Senator Hatch mentioned, that I have been trying to figure how do you pay it and how do you get those mothers who are going to become fewer and fewer to pay taxes for this.

I think that that system even will be so expensive that in the first phase of it I foresee a situation in which parents pay a fee according to their ability to pay to use that State system, which is the public school.

That will not be enough because there is a missing piece of the jigsaw puzzle, zero to three. We are all very worried about it. In that zero to three, what I would do in those schools would be to have an outreach program so it becomes the hub of those 20 or 30 family day care homes where most of the zero to three children are in that neighborhood.

We will then at long last have what educators were talking about 25 years ago, a community school that has two primary functions side by side, formal education of our children and the child care of these same children, because the approach of that building ought to be human development, not just formal education.

Senator DODD. That is a very exciting idea, Ed, and I am sure one that would provoke a lot of discussion along the way. I find it fascinating. I can see Toni ready to jump in on this one, and I think Caro as well.

I am going to turn it over to Senator Mikulski, however, because I know she has some questions, but feel free to comment on that one.

Ms. PORTER. I will. I will answer it after you ask me a question.

Senator DODD. Barbara.

Senator MIKULSKI. Well, first, I would like to compliment the entire panel for their interest and commitment to children.

In the interests of time, I am going to focus my questions on Ms. Porter and Ms. Travis, though what Dr. Zigler has just said is really a fascinating idea because, Senator Dodd, I feel that what is going to happen to the public school is that it really is going to become the new settlement house, if you will, and perform a variety of functions for not only children, but for the entire family.

It will assume a different character depending on the character and culture of the community, so that, for example, in the South and Southwest it might be where people are going to learn English, get ready to take citizenship classes, while their children are doing exactly the same thing down the hall.

That is really what the function of the school is going to be, in addition to the formal three Rs.

But right now, just focusing on some very specific points, I would like to first talk to Ms. Porter in terms of the functions that they provide at Child Care, Inc., in New York City, one of which, of course, is the information and advice to parents, which is an issue I am very keenly interested in—the efficient use of existing resources and the promulgation of their availability.

My question to you is, in terms of the multiplicity of functions that you provide, how important would you say that I and R service is, and then how was it paid for. Do you receive government funds, at what level, non-profit, et cetera?

Ms. PORTER. Thank you for asking me that question, and I will answer it and then I would like to address the vision that Dr. Zigler has raised for us.

The I and R function at Child Care, Inc., is our key function. It is not only our eyes and ears for what is happening in the community, but it is the way that we feel that we are meeting the needs of parents most efficiently.

We have a data bank of 2,000 programs, licensed programs in New York City, and we feel that we can offer parents the choice of child care from a range of different options.

Until recently, we received approximately one-tenth of our budget from public sources. The remainder was divided among contributions from private foundations and corporations, corporate contracts, and, to some extent, some membership dues. We feel that we are performing a public function. We are increasing the accessibility of child care.

In our second function, by providing technical assistance, we are expanding the availability of child care. We think that we deserve some public funds to do this. Dr. Zigler mentioned a little bit earlier the fact that he has been taking his tin cup around the country to do a public relations campaign about family day care. Well, child care resource and referral agencies like ours have been passing the cup for 10 years, and we think it is time that there be somebody in the public sector to help us out.

Just to address a little bit of the vision that was raised for us, I agree with you that it is a marvelous vision that the school could be a settlement house. The reality is, Senator, that at least in New York City the schools are very far removed in many cases from the needs of the members of their community.

While we endorse the notion of universally available child care and early childhood education programs, which we certainly think would be an ideal situation, without, by the way, any parent fee, we would suggest that those programs be available in a range of settings—not just the public schools, but also day care centers, Head Start programs, family day care homes. That way parents can have an opportunity to choose those programs that best fit their own cultural and other values and their child's needs, at the same time, we can offer a range of other kinds of services as well.

Senator MIKULSKI. I also believe that we cannot accomplish this without the involvement of the business community.

Ms. PORTER. Yes.

Senator MIKULSKI. And then the question becomes, what is the best way to develop public-private partnerships. I note in your comments that you involved several corporations. My question is, when the corporations call you up or you call them up—of course, I am always interested in who makes the first call, but what do the corporations want.

Then, based on what they want, what could we expect from them in terms of their role? For example, when they call you, what do they want? Can we, in turn, expect from them an advocacy?

Whether you are going to Albany, whether you are coming to Washington, whether we are pouring over our black books looking at solutions, we need business advocates like Arnold Hyatt at Stride Rite and what IBM is doing, and then have you involve them in that.

And then, also, what type of incentives do you think we could provide the private sector, if at all, in terms of financial resources for day care?

Ms. PORTER. OK, let me disabuse you of a notion. We call the corporations; they do not call us. While there is a rising tide of concern about child care in this country, it has not necessarily reached the board rooms of the major corporations.

But now that I have said that, let me say to you that some of our best supporters are those employers with whom we have corporate contracts. We have a major corporate contract with American Express, and I believe that some representatives from that corporation have been to Washington within the past several months to support the need for expanding child care.

To answer your question about what we can do to involve them, I think that a number of States, and certainly the Child Care Action Campaign, have proposed establishing business councils to work with government about meeting the child care needs of employees, and I think that is an approach that bears serious consideration.

I think that there is more that we can do to enlighten corporate leaders and that they can do to enlighten us about the problems that their employees face. In terms of incentives, I think we might propose more reliance on the dependent care assistance programs; for example, flexible benefit plans, cafeteria benefts and other programs like that.

Senator MIKULSKI. Thank you. I could talk to you all day, but when you talk about these relationships with these 16 corporations, what is the nature of that relationship? What do you do for them?

Ms. PORTER. We provide their employees with special assistance. Any employee of a corporation that has a contract with us can call us for assistance in finding child care.

Our counselors treat them the same way that they treat other parents who happen to find our name in the phone book. They give them advice, they ask them what they are looking for, they help them find appropriate child care, et cetera, et cetera, and they will send them booklets to supplement to counseling.

The principal difference, however, Senator, is that we do a follow-up call on a regular basis to find out if that child care arrangement has worked out and if the parent needs any other additional assistance, and we send the corporations a report.

Senator MIKULSKI. So, essentially, what your contractual arrangement is is for the I and R aspects?

Ms. PORTER. Yes.

Senator MIKULSKI. If I could now, just moving to Ms. Travis, Ms. Travis, when I look over your report in finding child care in metropolitan Atlanta, just looking at some of your innovations here, the emergency child care, the refugee child care assistance project, the employer involvement, is really, I think, something we can all learn from.

You have really done a lot of the very practical activities.

Ms. Travis and the Save the Children organization has essentially, I think, Senator Dodd, been running demonstration projects for us without a lot of recognition and I am sure minimal funding.

Ms. Travis, you have heard my questions to Ms. Porter, and essentially they are the same to you. Could you elaborate on the I and R aspect in terms of how important it is and where you get funded?

Ms. TRAVIS. I think for us, too, that parent counseling, which is what we call it rather than parent advice, is really the heart of our program. You know, we do a lot of listening and we do a lot of helping people to think through what the best plan for them is.

In terms of funding, you know, what we do is hustle. We have no——

Senator MIKULSKI. You say hustle?

Ms. TRAVIS. Hustle for funding. We have no United Way money. We have no State money. Two of our counties now are giving us a little bit of money, but the rest of it is corporate contracts. We have some corporate donations, we have some foundation grants.

But, you know, that does not go on forever and we do have to stabilize that. We also contract with two of our private industry councils and we do the child care counseling for the women in the JTPA training, and then we handle a voucher payment for them.

So, you know, funding is a real difficult issue for us, but I am so convinced that this is the way that we have to go in getting a delivery system—again, responding a little bit to Ed's suggestion, you know, the public school involvement is not something that I have been enthusiastic about, partly because we do such a rotten job in a lot of parts of our State with the children that we already have.

But then I also remember that once upon a time we had Lanham Act money and the public schools ran——

Senator MIKULSKI. You had what?

Ms. TRAVIS. Lanham Act during World War II. See, this is my long memory. We had very good programs that were operated through the public schools. You know, I was not into the policy and how that worked, but what I am saying is we should not maybe throw the idea totally out.

I also started out in the old settlement house setting and I think that a program to meet all kinds of needs is a worthy concept.

Senator MIKULSKI. When you refer people through I and R, you then do follow-up to see how it worked out and that is an important component, is that right?

Ms. TRAVIS. We do follow-up with our corporate clients and we try to do a 10-percent sample on our community line. You know, the reason that we do not do more is, again, the cost.

Senator MIKULSKI. Just moving on, I note that also on page two of your testimony you run these workshops that I am talking about, these one-stop shops; how to start a family day care program, how to start a day care center.

Would you talk to me about whether or not you have a lot of participation in that? Second, then, what is your relationship in local government, particularly in what we would call the business side, zoning, et cetera, and do you then follow up with them?

Ms. TRAVIS. Yes. We have zoning problems. In our area, we are involved in eleven counties, and there are also about 23 different municipalities. A couple of years ago, we got a State law introduced and passed that would have made family day care a residential use of property, but the governor vetoed it. So we are back to square one fighting it out county by county.

We have been able to bring about some changes, but, you know, that is a barrier still in some of our communities. One of the reasons that we have been working on this church strategy is because some of the churches are already ensconced in these neighborhoods that will not allow either family day care or day care centers. So, you know, that zoning thing is part of the factor there.

In terms of regulation, we have a system of registration where basically the providers get a set of very minimum standards and then self-certify that they meet those regulations. We now also have fingerprinting, which has, you know, slowed up the process.

But there is a real balance between having enough protection and not so much that you do not have any programs that you even know about. Basically, I favor the registration. I would like to see them do a 20-percent follow-up.

But, again, most of our people who bother to get registered do so because they are on the food program.

Senator MIKULSKI. Ms. Travis, we can talk about registration, but when you hold those workshops how many people turn out? Is there an interest?

Ms. TRAVIS. Yes, there is. We will have anywhere from 15 to 30 people turn out for a workshop on how to start a family day care home.

Senator MIKULSKI. And then, of that, how many do you think are interested in actually then proceeding?

Ms. TRAVIS. We do not have a mechanism to track them, but we know that some do. We know some people come to those because they read "Day Care" and what they really are thinking about is a day care center. But quite a few of them do.

We have a grant now from Mervin's to recruit and train more family day care homes, and since last October under that grant we have recruited and trained about 60.

Senator MIKULSKI. Mr. Chairman, if I could just ask one other question of Ms. Travis?

Senator DODD. Sure.

Senator MIKULSKI. We have talked about the day care center, where it should be located, and then we have talked about family day care, which in some ways is the sole provider.

Do you think there is an intermediate opportunity? I know, Ms. Travis, you spoke about the churches, but essentially along a co-op model where women working in their own community and neigh-

borhood, without the stresses and strains, essentially, of a small business owner of insurance, regulation, and so on—a church or other non-profit facility would provide the physical infrastructure and then maybe the support where the women themselves could form a small business and be essentially contracted for service to be provided, and thus not be doing it alone.

The supervision would be multiple, it would alleviate some of the stress, and somewhere there there may be an intermediary that we should be looking at.

Ms. TRAVIS. I think there are a lot of possibilities. We are just starting a new project in an inner-city neighborhood where we will be doing that very thing. We will have a hub that will be in a church where people come in with their children for training. I think the concept of networks is extremely important.

We also have a rural system where we have homes spread out over several counties where we provide supports and services and we bring them together, also. You know, the bringing together—Toni spoke of the importance of training, but just the fact that people come together and they see that they are recognized as an important part of the child caring system, I think, does so much for their self-concept.

You get away from that; well, I babysit or I keep kids. You know, they are a part of that system and they like to hear it, and they need to be told that and they need to have the chance to come together.

I can tell you want to say something.

Ms. PORTER. Yes. I just wanted to say there is another aspect of that, too, and it is empowerment, Senator. What we are trying to do in our Neighborhood Child Care Initatives Project (NCCIP) is encourage folks to start their own licensed family day care homes as businesses.

Once they become small businessmen, they become empowered, and that is a very critical factor in this program. They are not babysitters. They are professionals and they can change their communities.

Senator MIKULSKI. Do you like the idea or the concept of grouping together?

Ms. PORTER. That is what we are doing in New York City in our particular family day care expansion—the NCCIP—project, only we do not limit it to churches. We use a community-based organization, a neighborhood improvement association, something along those lines, and that serves as the hub.

You do not need very much space, by the way. What you need is a small office in which you can offer some training, or the basement of some church in which you can offer some training, one telephone and one desk.

The sponsor of the network serves as the hub, recruits providers, trains them and helps them to become licensed, and refers parents who need care to those providers in the network. It works very well.

Dr. ZIGLER. Senator Mikulski, I want to just issue a word of warning to this Committee. First of all, it would be impolite of me if I did not point out to you, Senator Mikulski, that I came and testified in favor of your information and referral system when you

were a Member of the House of Representatives, and I am glad that you were able to pull that one off for us all.

I am particularly delighted to find you on this committee because in my years here in Washington, I have found too many summer soldiers, and your own perseverance in this area should be applauded.

But I do wish to give you a warning. Many of us do not feel that we have been heard by this nation or by the Congress or by the executive branch, and the hour is growing very late for this country on this child care issue.

What I have been witnessing and what is embedded in your suggestion is to do a little bit more of what we have been doing in this country now for a quarter of a century while this problem has gotten out of hand; namely, band-aids, a little thing here, a little thing there.

It is like we do not really see that what is required for a problem of this magnitude is a very basic structural institutional change in our nation which guarantees the public provision of child care in exactly the same way as we now produce education.

On the business side of things, I have very little difficulty with my friends in business discussing these matters. The fact is you change your language a little bit. They speak to me about human capital and competitiveness. How are we going to compete with the Japanese and the West Germans?

Well, my friends in economics finally educated me that when they are talking human capital, what they are talking about is children. If we do not produce children in this nation that allows these children to be the kinds of optimal workers that employers need, then the entire business community is the loser.

So part of our problem with the business community—many of them are becoming aware of this at long last, but part of it will be a public education campaign which people such as yourself will have to help conduct.

Senator DODD. Ed, if I could just interrupt one second on that point, I am delighted to hear that is occurring out there and some language barriers are disappearing. But, there is another problem, and that is you have too many of these people still thinking in terms of business quarters.

They accept your logic. They know that that next generation has to be the best qualified workforce this country has ever produced. The problem is getting them to invest in a generation which they will not be around to be the CEO of. That is where I find the difficulty.

Corporations have been terrific at the university level in this country, getting involved when they realize there is a product coming out of that institution that is immediately hireable. So, where you can show them that immediate and direct link, they do well.

They are even getting pretty good at the high school levels and the vocational schools because there they can see the direct linkage. You get down to the infant care and child care issue and it seems to escape them. They do not understand the direct, immediate benefit to them, and that is the major problem I see in trying

to link these things up. It just does not tie together for them, at least in the time frames that they are thinking about.

I did not mean to interrupt, but that is——

Dr. ZIGLER. You are exactly right. That is why I say that part of it is the short-sightedness of a lot of people in the business world, but there are some long-sighted people. Irving Harris, a man 70-some years old who starts the Beethoven Project in a ghetto, a housing project in Chicago—so when you talk about the business community, Senator Dodd, as you are aware, I am sure, it is a very variegated group of people.

Some are visionaries and can indeed think about the sweep of history; others cannot.

Senator DODD. I usually find that the most established or the most comfortable and secure business people are the most open. It is the ones who are insecure that do not want to get into this subject matter for the reasons we discussed earlier. Those who are insecure feel it is kind of a "wimpish" subject matter.

In fact, every time I hold a conference on this subject in Connecticut or elsewhere and I ask corporations to send representatives, they always give some woman the morning off to come because it is kind of a cute issue, you know.

They are not sending their top financial officer or the senior vice president to talk about it. The notion seems to be "we will send the gals out to this one". So we still have a major problem with many corporations, unfortunately.

I am sorry. I did not mean to digress.

Senator MIKULSKI. No. I am through.

Senator DODD. Thank you all. Listen, I have written questions for you. This panel is terrific. I feel embarrassed that we are not spending the day with you because you have so much to say. So if it is all right with you, we will send you some additional written questions to give us some more information on this critical issue.

We have a third panel to go, and thank God I have a partner here in Mikulski who is hanging around to work on this. Our last panel of witnesses include Helen Blank, who is the Director of Child Care of the Children's Defense Fund in Washington; Doug Baird, who is the Chair of the Child Care Task Force, Child Welfare League; Arnold Fege, Director of the Office of Governmental Relations of the National PTA; and Wendy Sherman, Special Secretary for Children and Youth, State of Maryland, Baltimore, Maryland.

A little background on these people as they get settled here. Helen Blank, as I mentioned, is the Director of Child Care, Children's Defense Fund. She has been with the Children's Defense Fund for 8 years and has become a real authority in the area of child care. We look forward to hearing from Helen about a new broad-based coalition, the Alliance for Better Child Care, which she is very involved in.

Doug Baird is, as I said earlier, the Chair of the Child Care Task Force, Child Welfare League, from Boston. The Child Welfare League is also playing a lead role, I would point out, in the Alliance for Better Child Care. The League is recognized nationwide as the standard-setting organization for children's services, including

child day care. We look forward to hearing from Doug about his hands-on experience in Boston.

Arnold Fege is the Director of the Office of Governmental Relations, PTA. He serves as the coordinator of the National Coalition for Public Education, which includes 68 associations nationwide. He is a former teacher, administrator, and executive assistant to the National Academy of School Executives. Mr. Fege is well qualified to bring us his perspective on schools and parents with respect to child care.

Lastly, Wendy Sherman, is from Baltimore, Special Secretary for Children and Youth. She coordinates all of Maryland's efforts with respect to child care. She must have listened to the one-stop shopping, that Senator Mikulski has been talking about.

Wendy also serves as the Director of the Governor's Office of Children and Youth. She is the first Director of the Office of Child Welfare and has served as the administrative assistant to my colleague from Maryland, Senator Mikulski.

So we are delighted to have all of you here. I apologize. This has gone a little bit longer than I had anticipated. I hoped to have you on a little earlier. I say that to every last panel in every hearing I have held this year, for those of you who have been here before.

I do not know of any quick way, maybe starting at 7:00 in the morning, to try and deal with these things in a half a day. I hear boos and hisses from the back from the staff, so that idea has just been dropped.

We will start with you, Mr. Fege.

STATEMENTS OF ARNOLD FEGE, DIRECTOR, OFFICE OF GOVERNMENTAL RELATIONS, NATIONAL PTA, WASHINGTON, DC; DOUGLAS BAIRD, CHAIR, DAY CARE TASK FORCE, CHILD WELFARE LEAGUE OF AMERICA, INC., AND EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR, ASSOCIATED DAY CARE SERVICES OF METROPOLITAN BOSTON, BOSTON, MA; HELEN BLANK, DIRECTOR OF CHILD CARE, CHILDREN'S DEFENSE FUND, WASHINGTON, DC; AND WENDY R. SHERMAN, SPECIAL SECRETARY FOR CHILDREN AND YOUTH, STATE OF MARYLAND, BALTIMORE, MD

Mr. FEGE. Mr. Chairman, thank you.

Senator DODD. Your written testimony will be accepted, by the way in its entirety. So if you can abbreviate your remarks, please do. I would ask you to try and paraphrase, wherever possible.

Mr. FEGE. And I shall do that.

Senator DODD. Thank you.

Mr. FEGE. Mr. Chairman, I thank you for this opportunity this morning. Senator Mikulski, the National PTA appreciates your support. It is like preaching to the choir, but we would like to paraphrase our statement this morning, since the full text will be in the record.

The National PTA is an organization of over 6 million members, with about 25,000 local school-based units. Our membership and our power is at the local level, and during my testimony this morning I would like to highlight the need for affordable, quality child care, the positive effect that quality child care and early educational programs can possess, and the National PTA's views on

how public schools can also play a role in the closing of the child care gap, and perhaps embellish what Dr. Zigler talked about this morning.

Let us point out at the outset that the case for affordable, equitable, safe child care cannot be disputed. Year after year, different levels of government and the various sectors of our society discuss and analyze and reanalyze the wisdom of offering child care to its citizens.

Yet, our infants do not stop growing while they wait for a more nurturing world, a world that sometimes appears totally oblivious to the link between our young children and the nation's economic prosperity, political future, and the quality of life of our next generation.

Dr. Zigler is somewhat of a mentor to me. I began in public education as a teacher and then as the principal of a school that had a Head Start program, and I remember at that time the idealism about serving another group of children, the opportunity to integrate and link Head Start with an instructional program that was focused on children, and the welcoming arms of administrators and school boards because they could serve another group of children.

I do not know about you all, but this last 7 years has been hell. Instead of trying to build programs and instead of trying to build foundations for children, we seem to be maintaining what we have. The fact that we have kept Head Start and Title XX even at level funding is a miracle, considering the difficult political problems that we have had.

Quality child care is the nation's lay-away plan. Yet, the lack of affordable, quality child care is so critical that millions of children are at risk and the demand exceeds the supply and there are reports that children as young as 3 or 4 years old are left without any supervision or under the care of a sibling who often is not much older than the children they are caring for.

Some respond that parents must become more responsible for their children's caregiving needs. Indeed, the National PTA believes that the primary responsibility for the education of children lies with the family. The family is the most important, integral, influential unit for the care of young children. That is precisely why the federal government must act to enhance child care, which indeed enhances the quality of family life.

A family needs help from their community, they need help from their government, and they need help from the private sector. The United States is the only country in the industrialized world where family, women and children are the poorest segment of our population. This is absolutely despicable.

The number of eligible Head Start children has increased by one-third, while the Head Start budget has been barely level-funded, and still meets the needs of only 20 percent of the eligible population.

As I go from State to State and talk to families, I find out that both parents must work to make ends meet and where they, in combination, make $30,000 or $35,000. Where, 10 years ago, that would have been a fortune, in today's economy that hardly puts a roof over their head and yet alone begins to meet the quality child care needs of several children.

I talk to families that have to juggle work schedules, one working the day shift and the other parent working the night shift, making the sacrifice to be home when the children are home because there are absolutely no options for child care for their children.

I talk to parents whose children are abused in unlicensed and unregulated child care facilities because the State does not believe it has a role in monitoring private facilities and setting the kind of high standards that Ed Zigler was talking about.

I talk to the single parent who must work, has no choice but to work, but does not earn enough money to place their child in a quality child care center.

And the problem is not short-term. Approximately 23 million pre-schoolers will require quality child care services by 1990. That is a cohort; that is a number that is not going to change. That is what we are going to be facing.

The lack of adequate care options is an immediate problem that could be detailed at length, and the pressures placed on families could be substantiated by anecdote after anecdote of human struggle in my organizations and in other organizations of our country.

But I would like, however, to move beyond the problems and explore ideas of how the child care needs for working parents can be met. Clearly, there are no absolutes, no one solution, no panacea, but certainly the response is not so acutely irresolvable as to paralyze the passage of effective programs at all three levels of our government.

What we must endeavor to achieve is a nationwide child care system, a system that meets the needs of working parents while increasing the likelihood that the health and welfare of all children are guaranteed.

The PTA has been working with the Alliance of Better Child Care, a coalition of 70 organizations in pursuit of common objectives, and I would like to cite those this morning.

First, the National PTA believes that the involvement of parents at all levels of decisionmaking in child care, including the planning of programs and the evaluation of programs, is paramount. It is the empowerment issue for our organization.

Number two, we would like to make child care more affordable for low- and moderate-income families. Number three, we would like to increase the number of child care facilities and the number of qualified child care staff. We would like to improve the quality of child care available and upgrade standards.

We would like to upgrade the working conditions and benefits of child care workers who are, indeed, low-paid, very honest professionals; coordinate child care resources to make a wide range of options available to parents, including home-based care, center-based care, and those that would be located in the public schools.

Let me just comment just briefly on the role of the public schools. We believe that the public schools can play a positive role in helping parents meet caregiving demands while meeting the developmental needs of children and providing an important option.

We think that this is not a problem. We think that this is an opportunity for the public schools, and we understand that at present the issue of child care in the public schools may be contentious.

For the school, the issue may be one of funding additional responsibilities on top of an already overburdened administrative and teaching staff, unavailable space, transportation costs.

For parents and child care providers, the problem of undue academic stress on children, larger class size in many of our schools, the concern about the emphasis of education over other developmental needs of their children, are indeed all legitimate as well.

But the seriousness and dimension of the problem mandates that the two groups come together and work these problems out in a collaborative relationship. In fact, I believe that this new relationship probably will move the child care workers more in the direction of education, considering the push for educational reform, but I also hope that it would push our public schools into an understanding that our children have more than just educational needs; they have other developmental needs.

Programs such as this are working around the country, and you know what they are—the Perry School in Ypsilanti. Head Start is obviously an excellent example, and the high school programs, and there are excellent models of private-public relationship in Memphis, Baltimore, New York, and Los Angeles.

We would be very supportive to see that option pursued.

We also support latchkey programs, before and after-school programs. There are many of our people who are volunteering before and after school in our local units, but the same thing that is happening to our organization is happening to the work force at-large.

We have fewer and fewer volunteers able to contribute more and more volunteer time that is needed.

I would like to also say something about the work ethic and the conservatives that are pushing the work ethic and those that are pushing workfare for welfare mothers. I think that is a good idea, but we cannot pursue the work ethic and talk about the importance of work while at the same time we are pulling families away from their children without providing needed services.

Those are a continuum. One is linked to the other, and we would like to give a word of warning to those who would pursue one over the other.

I would like to just cite five or six initiatives that the National PTA thinks that the Congress could pursue. One is certainly increased Title XX funds and Head Start funding. We are an avid supporter of Head Start funding and we would like to see these funds increased to at least meet 50 percent of the eligible population.

Support the expansion of Chapter I services to pre-schoolers. H.R. 5, which is the omnibus education bill, has passed the House and has included that option. We would also like to see the Senate pass it as well.

Establish a grant program to find incentive programs that offer in-service training for teachers and caregivers. Increase the supply of child care through grant and loan programs to caregivers and to programs.

Improve the quality of child care through federally-funded provider training and consumer education programs. Require minimum health and safety standards for all child care facilities, co-

ordinate resources in child care services, and encourage longitudinal research through federal grant programs.

In all, we believe that a coordination between education and child care is important. Senator Dodd, we support the Younger Americans Act. We think that the Younger Americans Act in coordinating resources and targeting the issue of care among our youngsters can be just as effective as the Older Americans Act, and we are committed to see that bill passing in the 100th Congress.

Mr. Chairman, Senator Mikulski, we appreciate this opportunity to present our views on child care.

[The prepared statement of Mr. Fege follows:]

The National PTA
700 North Rush Street
Chicago Illinois 60611-2571
(312) 787-0977

Office of Governmental Relations
1201 16th Street N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036
(202) 822-7878

Testimony by The National PTA

Before the Subcommittee on Children,

Family, Drugs, and Alcoholism

Committee on Labor and Human Resources

U.S. Senate

regarding

Child Care and Early Childhood Education

by Arnold Fege

Director of the Office of Governmental Relations

The National PTA

June 11, 1987

Good Morning. I am Arnold Fege, representing the National Congress of Parents and Teachers. With over six million members and currently celebrating our 90th year anniversary, the National PTA is one of the largest and oldest organizations whose members advocate on behalf of children and youth.

As the Director of the Governmental Relations Office of the National PTA, I would like to express my pleasure at having the opportunity to address the Chairman and the other committee members, regarding the continuing crisis in child care. The National PTA, has long recognized the importance of child care programs and facilities in meeting the needs of both school-age and preschool children. Quality child care is, in fact, early childhood education.

During my testimony, I will highlight the need for affordable, quality child care; the positive effect that quality child care and early educational programs can possess; and the National PTA's views on how public schools can also play a role in closing the child care gap. Finally, I will mention several initiatives that the federal government can foster or enhance, to improve access to quality child care for all children.

As the committee members are aware, the inability to find affordable, quality child care can, and does, cripple the economic and social well-being of many families. When child care is needed but cannot be obtained, both the parent and the child

suffer. If care is secured but is of poor quality, the child suffers, as does the family. When families and family life are in peril, ultimately we as a society suffer, for as a nation our future is in jeopardy.

The lack of affordable, quality child care is so critical that millions of children are at risk. Presently in our country, nearly six million children 13 years old or younger are unsupervised for some portion of the day. There are reports that children as young as three and four years old are left without any supervision or under the care of a sibling, who often is not much older then themselves.

Some respond that parents must become more responsible for their children's caregiving needs. The National PTA believes that the primary responsibility for the education of children lies with the family. Our position is that parents must share responsibility in the decisions about the child's education, as well as participate in organizations or activities that reflect the community's collective aspirations for the education of all children.

But in the same vein, we respond that our society must also be more responsible to its citizens. Similarly, a recent poll conducted by the American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees (AFSCME) shows that fifty-three percent of those responding indicated that they felt the demand for child care was greater than the supply. Further, seventy-one percent stated that the government should do more to supply affordable,

quality care for our nation's children.

The demand placed on families is extraordinary. Today, one out of every two women with a child under six years of age is in the labor force. The reason women work outside the home is economic survival. Two-thirds of the women in the labor force, with preschool children, are either supplementing a family income of $15,000 or less or are the family's sole wage earner. In 1985, one-fourth of all working mothers with dependent children were unmarried, and one-fourth of these women received no child support. Another 40 percent of these women were never awarded child support payments.

The lack of affordable, quality child care is not a short-term problem. By 1990, approximately 23 million preschoolers will require child care services. Fifty-five percent of married mothers with children under the age of six will be in the labor force, an 80 percent increase since 1970. By 1995, over three quarters of all school-age children will have mothers who work outside the home.

When affordable, quality child care is unavailable families suffer, but our society also pays a consequence. Surveys show that twenty-six percent of all mothers and 45 percent of single mothers with children five years or younger stated that they would enter the labor force if care was available for their child.

The lack of adequate child care options is an immense problem that could be detailed upon at length. I would like,

however, to move beyond the problems and explore several ideas as to how the child care needs of working parents can be met. Clearly, there is no absolute, no one solution. Just as child care needs are complex, so will be the plan to remedy the problems. What we must endeavor to achieve is a nationwide child care system. A system that meets the needs of working parents, while increasing the likelihood that the health and welfare of all children are guaranteed.

The Alliance for Better Child Care is a collaboration of nearly 70 education, parent and religious groups as well as labor unions and early childhood development experts who have initiated a movement to improve the child care options available to parents. Although still in its own "early developmental stage," The Alliance (or ABC as the group is often referred) is accomplished, in that, persons and association representatives with diverse interests have coalesced to define a common agenda.

For about a year, the National PTA has been working with Alliance members to develop a major national campaign to increase the number and improve the quality of child care programs. The Alliance has focused on the many aspects of child care needs in this country. The objectives of the Alliance are to make child care more affordable for low and moderate income families; increase the number of child care facilities and the number of qualified child care staff; improve the quality of child care available; upgrade the working conditions and benefits of child care professionals; and coordinate child care resources to ensure

their efficient use and help make a wide range of options available to parents.

The National PTA has worked with the Alliance because we believe that quality programs must be available to every child, and that access to child care and early childhood education programs is an equity issue. We believe that a child care system must be structured to give parents the option to choose the type of care that they feel is appropriate for their child. The system must build-in alternatives for all parents and every child. Some parents will select home-based child care, others may pick a center-based care. Still, other parents may prefer their child receive care within the public schools.

The National PTA realizes that now, as in the past, the issue of child care in the public schools can be contentious. The concerns of parents and child care advocates regarding "watered down curricula" for preschoolers and undue stress on children is legitimate. To ignore the potential pitfalls, we would do a disservice to those children who attend public school child care, and their parents. Yet, if problems are realized and corrected, child care in the public school system can be a viable alternative.

The National PTA believes the public schools can play a positive role in helping parents meet their caregiving demands, while meeting the developmental needs of the children. The goal of all child care programs, whether center-, home-, or school-based, must be to help children reach their full potential by

building self-esteem and spirit. Early childhood programs can be designed to provide children with the opportunity to explore and learn from their environment. Caregivers and preschool teachers, on the other hand, can be trained to respond to the child's developmental needs and identify signals that indicate a child's interest in an activity.

Inappropriate learning environments and practices can be avoided if careful examination is given to each program. A position, long-held by the National PTA, is that good schools involve the active participation and cooperation of the entire community. Notably, the National PTA feels that a primary component of any child care program in the public school is the incorporation of strong parental involvement provisions.

Our association believes that one way to ensure that the best interest of the child is served, is involving parents in the planning and evaluation of the program. In addition, parents must participate in the program on an on-going basis. Parental involvement, for example, is seen as a key component of Head Start and Chapter 1 programs, programs that have a demonstrated high rate of success in building children's self-worth and developmental skills.

Research has documented that these quality early childhood education programs are "prevention at its best". Another well noted program is the Perry Preschool Project in Ypsilanti, MI. Data from the longitudinal study show that the program was a cost-effective endeavor. For instance, higher taxes were paid by

former students. Yet, fewer dollars were expended on special education, welfare payments, and the criminal justice system. If measured in constant 1981 dollars, the program cost about $5,000 per child, but the return was $28,000 per child.

The question must be posed as to whether we, as a society, are willing to make such a short-term investment for such a long-term gain -- on behalf of all children. What the Perry Preschool Project, Head Start and other early child care programs prove is that quality education programs benefit everyone: parents, society at-large, but perhaps most importantly, the child.

There are very few early intervention programs. In twenty states no preschool programs exist whatsoever, while available programs in other states serve a limited number of children. Usually preschool programs service special needs children, such as the disabled, the poor, and those at risk of failure.

The research proves that quality preschool programs can make a significant contribution to a young child's life. If quality care is beneficial, we must question why all children do not have access to these programs. Providing school-based child care and preschool programs in the school is one step towards expanding equal educational opportunities to all children. This will also offer parents another option when determining what educational or child care program meets their child's needs.

Equally important is the role that schools can and do play in offering school-age care. Many schools play a primary role in providing before and after school care. Still, there remains a

great need to expand the number of before and after school programs. The number of school-age child care programs across the country is woefully inadequate in meeting the needs of all working parents.

Before and after school programs are available in only 150 of the nation's 15,000 school districts. While home-based caregivers have responded to meet this shortage, there are still too few in-school services available to meet the demands.

School-based programs, designed to provide recreation and stimulation to children before and after classes, can be a tremendous resource to the community, the parent, and the child. For example, if a program allows children to stay on the school grounds, transportation costs and worries can be eliminated. In turn, the child's transition at the beginning and the end of the day may be less disruptive.

In summation, schools can play a key role in meeting a family's child care needs, whether they offer a school-age or preschool program. Yet, the education community can not work within a vacuum, nor without additional resources. Communication must occur among parents, providers, early childhood development experts and appropriate community organizational representatives. Likewise, adequate financial support must be available to assist schools in adapting their facilities.

The National PTA believes there are several ways the federal government can help the state and local efforts to expand the availability of affordable, quality child care and early

childhood education programs. Primarily we believe that leadership at the federal level is desperately needed. Over the years we have seen federal initiatives on expanding or improving child care and early childhood programs. In fact, Senators on this committee have sponsored such legislation.

But, unfortunately, our national child care policy continues to resemble a patchwork quilt. The National PTA thinks that now we must look to establishing a comprehensive child care system; we need a policy that takes the pieces and weaves them together to form a blanket of protection for all children, options for parents, and benefits for child education professionals.

In the interest of time, I will highlight just a few ideas for inclusion in a child care initiative or for expanding current child care policy in the United States, our suggestions include the following:

- Increase Title XX and Head Start funding. These programs have proven their effectiveness in helping communities meet the child care demands as well as provide children with compensatory education skills.

- Support the expansion of Chapter 1 services to preshoolers. Currently, Chapter 1 dollars are not available for programs that service preschool-age children. In an effort to reach more children, Chapter 1 funds should be extended to early childhood education programs.

- Establish a grant program to fund incentive programs that offers in-service training for teachers and caregivers.

10

Recruitment and retention of qualified early childhood professionals continues to plague the child care community. Funding of an in-service training program can assist community programs to enlist and maintain qualified staff.

- Increase the supply of child care through grant and loans to caregivers and programs. New federal dollars will help a state increase the number of qualified caregivers. The money could be used to establish funds for grants and low-interest loans to start-up and expand child care programs.

- Improve the quality of child care though federally funded provider training and consumer education programs. Caregiving quality can be improved if funds are available to provide on-going training and technical assistance. Funds should also be available to create a consumer education program to help parents make informed decisions about their child's out-of-home care, including establishing state child care telephone hot lines which parents can use for additional information on child care.

- Require minimum health and safety standards for all child care facilities. Standards that increase the likelihood that children are cared for in a safe environment with qualified personnel should be enacted. Further, states should be encouraged to review and update their licensing standards regularly.

- Coordinate resources and child care services. States should be encouraged to review child care policy. Funds should be available for the development of local resource and referral

programs to help link parents with child care services.

- Encourage longitudinal research through a federal grant program. There are too few studies that show the positive impact of early childhood intervention or school-age child care programs. These studies are necessary if the program needs of parents and children are to examined and refined.

The National PTA believes these initiatives will help to improve the quality and accessibility of child care to parents. Of paramount concern is that quality child care and early education programs benefit the child.

Mr. Chairman, I thank you for the opportunity to testify.

June 11, 1987

Senator DODD. Thank you very much. Senator Kennedy, could not be here this morning, but he wanted you to know how much he appreciates what you have done. He has been very supportive of what we are doing in the child care area and he just wanted me to express his regrets to you personally that he could not be here this morning.

Mr. FEGE. I appreciate that. Thank you very much, Senator.

Senator DODD. We will move right down the line, and in the interests of time, could you paraphrase your statements so we can get to some questions? Otherwise we will have to submit written questions. I would prefer to do it in person.

Mr. Baird.

Mr. BAIRD. Chairman Dodd, Senator Mikulski, thank you very much for the opportunity to be here. My name is Douglas Baird. I am executive director of Associated Day Care Services of Metropolitan Boston. Associated Day Care is New England's oldest, largest charitable child day care agency. One of our programs this year is celebrating its 107th year.

I am here as the chairman of the Child Day Care Task Force of the Child Welfare League of America and I am pleased to testify. First, I want to thank both of you for your support in the field of child day care.

Senator Dodd, your support, particularly with regard to training and, Senator Mikulski, with regard to resource and referrals, those two movements are essential parts of what will, we hope, develop as a child day care community in the future.

The Child Welfare League has been involved in the issue of child day care for a quarter of a century. Our first child day care standards were set in 1960. The league has recently established a Day Care Task Force which I chair. We are proud also to serve on the steering committee of the Alliance for Better Child Care, and we are also a member of the National Ad Hoc Day Care Coalition.

In my testimony this morning, I will make three points. First, there is present and there will be in the future a critical need for child day care. Second, the traditional sectors of the society—families, communities, private employers, State and local governments—are unable currently to meet that need. Third, federal leadership is required.

I would like to discuss what the league believes federal leadership should entail. By now, the need for child day care in the country is obvious. I suspect the documentation of that is at least in part the basis of this morning's hearing. You can read about it daily in the Times, in the Post. Doonesbury is currently grappling with the issue. I hope next week he will be able to do better.

Increasingly, children are at risk in this country because working parents are having difficulty finding good quality child day care. Moreover, the problems are growing. Families are requiring two breadwinners just to make ends meet. More and more young families are headed by single parents, usually women who can be expected to earn less than their male counterparts.

For older children, the public school system provides a partial answer, although our growing awareness of the needs of latchkey children also underscores the very partial nature of that solution.

School hours, even extended, do not correspond to the needs of second-shift workers. Relatives can help and, of course, parents can purchase day care. More and more are required to do so. About 2 million children under the age of 6 are in day care centers or in nursery schools today.

But the cost of day care is going up and, with it, the inability of many families to afford adequate care. This is of critical importance to the one in five children living in low-income families, but it is becoming of increasing concern to middle-class families as well.

About a million-and-a-half children under the age of 5 are at considerable risk during at least some part of the day because they are not in any form of supervised care. This does not count the millions of other children up to 13 years of age who are unsupervised during part of the day, also.

It does not include those supervised by other children who are 7, 8, 9, and 10 years old. I might note that in our day care centers we get into arguments with our parents because they want to allow their 8- and 9-year-old children to bring their 3- and 4-year-old children home. We do not allow it.

It does not include those looked after out of necessity by neighbors who may well not be suited to be child care workers at all. It does not include those dropped off at unlicensed day care facilities which fail to meet even the basic health and safety standards.

I will go back again. A million-and-a-half pre-school children in this country are unattended at least part of the day while their parents are working.

The traditional and formal providers of child care are inadequate for literally millions of children. Families cannot meet the need. Ozzie and Harriet and even the more modern family that you heard about on television earlier today do not meet the needs of children. Dad is working; mom is working, too.

By 1990, in just 3 years, 75 percent of all mothers will work outside the home. Family incomes demand it and the national economy requires it. It is not a luxury anymore.

Changing social patterns have also affected the ability of extended families to address child care needs. Relatives cannot do it, neighbors cannot do it. Those federal officials who would suggest that relatives and neighbors are the remedy for the nation's day care needs—no-cost, low-cost solutions—are every bit as enlightened as those who prescribe sunglasses and suntan lotion for environmental damage from the ozone layer. [Laughter.]

Community institutions are insufficient. Schools provide a partial answer for older children and can be looked at for increasing roles in the after-school environment for some of those older children, but they presently do little to address the needs of most preschoolers. While the contributions of local United Ways, human service organization charities, and religious organizations are increasingly substantial, they too fall short.

Private employers have yet to address the need in any quantitatively meaningful way. Despite the efforts of the White House Office of Private Sector Initiatives to encourage private employer involvement in day care, the Bureau of National Affairs reports in "Employers and Child Care: Development of a New Employee Ben-

efit" that only 1,000 employers are providing any child care assistance at all. Consider that there are 350,000 employers with 20 or more employees; 1,000 is pretty small, is it not?

Those who provide assistance tend to favor information and referral services and flexible benefit plans rather than the direct provision of care. I believe we are unlikely to see substantial growth of employer support of child care for low and mid-income wage-earners, exactly the population we need to provide child care support for.

State and local public agencies are consistently reporting difficulty in providing child care assistance, especially since they have been forced to compensate for the 20-percent reduction, not accounting for inflation, in federal Title XX funding since 1981.

They have generally been forced to limit day care assistance to welfare families and those hardest hit by depressed economies. The middle class and working poor have been bypassed, and the ability to go from being welfare-poor to moving up through the economy is almost non-existent, given current federal law.

Federal leadership is required. What should the federal leadership look like? The league believes that Congress should develop and pass a comprehensive national piece of child day care legislation. Such legislation should be broad-based.

My time has expired. I have many more things to say and I will be brief. I would say that it is a tremendous opportunity to be here to speak to you. I think earlier this morning you heard about the potential for some demonstration projects and some things that people see as demonstration projects.

Massachusetts is a demonstration project. I want to be the first to welcome you, Senator Dodd, to Massachusetts next Monday on the subject of your parental leave bill. It is one-half of the coin that has to do with very young children. I want you to come and see our child care programming, also.

Senator DODD. Anything else you want me to do? [Laughter.]

If you have time, yes.

[The prepared statement of Mr. Baird follows:]

CHILD WELFARE LEAGUE OF AMERICA, INC.

TESTIMONY OF

THE CHILD WELFARE LEAGUE OF AMERICA

BEFORE THE

SUBCOMMITTEE ON CHILDREN, FAMILY, DRUGS AND ALCOHOLISM

COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND HUMAN RESOURCES

UNITED STATES SENATE

HEARING REGARDING

CHILD CARE

JUNE 11, 1987

PRESENTED BY

DOUGLAS BAIRD
EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

ASSOCIATED DAY CARE SERVICES OF
METROPOLITAN BOSTON

BOSTON, MASSACHUSETTS

Mr. Chairman and members of the Subcommittee. My name is Douglas Baird and I am the Executive Director of Associated Day Care Services of Metropolitan Boston. I am also Chairman of the Day Care Task Force of the Child Welfare League of America and am pleased to testify this morning on the League's behalf regarding the increasingly growing problem of supplying this nation's children with affordable, quality day care.

The Child Welfare League was the first and continues to be the only national, not-for-profit, voluntary membership organization which sets standards for child welfare services in the United States and Canada. The League is comprised of 465 child welfare agencies plus an additional 1200 affiliates in our 28 state child care association.

CWLA has been involved in the issue of child day care for nearly a quarter of a century. Our first child day care standards were developed and published in 1960. The League has recently established a Day Care Task Force, which I chair. We are also proud to serve on the Steering Committee for the Alliance for Better Child Care (ABC) and as a member of the National Ad Hoc Day Care Coalitions.

In my testimony this morning, I will hope to make three points. First, there is at present and will be in the future a critical need for child day care. Secondly, traditional sectors

of society, including families, communities, private employers, and state and local governments seem unable to meet that need and federal leadership is required. Last of all, I would like to discuss what CWLA believe's that federal leadership should entail.

By now the need for child day care in this country is obvious nearly to all. I suspect the documentation of that need is, at least in part, the basis of this morning's hearing. You can read about it almost daily in the New York Times and Washington Post. Even the characters of "Doonsbury" are grappling with the issue. From the front page to funny pages, this is what we know. Increasingly, children are at risk in this country because working parents are having difficulty finding good day care they can afford. Moreover, the problem is growing, as families require two breadwinners just to maintain their standard of living and as we have increasing numbers of households headed by single parents --usually women, who can be expected to earn significantly less than their male counterparts. The Census Bureau recently reported that in 1984 nearly one of every four children lived in such families. About three of four lived in families either headed by single parents or where both parents were required to work. In other words, 75 percent of the 48 million children in this country, 36 million, require some supervision beyond that which parents themselves can provide.

Now, of course, for older children the public school system provides a partial answer, although the growing problem of latch-key children testify to inability to totally address the needs of even this age group. Relatives can help and, of course, parents can purchase day care. More and more are required to do so. About 2 million children under six were in day care centers or nursery schools in 1984.

But the cost of day care is going up and with it, the inability of many families to afford adequate care. This is of critical importance to the one of five children living in low-income families but it is becoming of increasing concern to middle class families as well. Sandra Scarr, in her book Mother Care, Other Care estimates that nearly one of ten (7 percent) of preschool children in this country are unattended for at least part of the time their parents are working. That's about 1.5 million children under 5 years of age at considerable risk during at least some part of the day: at risk of accident and sometimes tragically at risk of death. One- and one-half million children under five years of age. This does not count the millions of other children up to thirteen years of age who may be unsupervised during part of the day. It does not include those supervised only by other children or by teenagers. It does not include those looked after out of necessity by neighbors who may not be suited for child care. It does not include those dropped

off at unlicensed facilities which fail to meet even health and safety standards.

One- and one-half million preschool children in this country are unattended at least part of the day while their parents are working. It is not only a problem of affordability, but of supply as well. In some areas of the country, even families who can afford the average $200 to $300 a month required for child care can't find it.

Obviously, the traditional formal and informal providers of child care are inadequate for literally millions of children. Families, alone, can no longer meet the need. The Ozzie and Harriet family of the 1950's where Dad worked and Mom stayed home with the kids is a thing of the past. By 1990 -- in just three years -- 75 percent of all mothers will work outside the home. Family incomes demand it and the national economy requires it. It is no longer a luxury. This is compounded by a sharp increase in single parent families. Nearly two-thirds of all women in the work place are either single (25 percent), divorced (12 percent), widowed (5 percent), separated (4 percent), or have husbands earning less than $15,000 (17 percent).

Changing social patterns have also removed the ability of the extended family to address day care needs. Relatives can't do it --the days when Aunt Sarah or Grandma lived next door or down the street are long gone. Neighbors can't do it -- they

themselves are after all required in the work place and are likely struggling with day care shortages as well. Those federal officials who suggest relatives and neighbors as a remedy for the nation's day care needs are every bit as enlightened as those who prescribe sunglasses and suntan lotion for environmental damage to the ozone layer.

Community institutions are insufficient. Schools provide a partial answer for older children and can be looked to for increasing roles in after-school-care; but they presently do little to address the needs of most preschoolers. While the contributions of local United Ways, human service organization charities, and religious organizations are increasingly substantial, they too fall short.

Private employers have not addressed the need. Despite efforts by the Reagan White House Office of Private Sector Initiatives to encourage private employer involvement in day care, the Bureau of National Affairs reports in Employers and Child Care: Development of a New Employee Benefit that only about 1,000 employers provide day care assistance to their employers. Consider that there are more than 350,000 employers employing more than 20 employees and you gain a quick realization of just how tiny a fraction that 1,000 represents. Those who do provide assistance tend to favor information and referral services and flexible benefit plans rather than direct provision of day care.

State and local Public agencies are consistently reporting difficulty in providing child day care assistance, especially since they have been forced to compensate for the 20 percent reduction (not accounting for inflation) in federal Title XX funding since 1981. They have generally been forced to limit day care assistance to welfare families and those hardest hit by depressed economies. The middle class has been bypassed.

Federal leadership is required. What should that Federal leadership look like? The Child Welfare League of America believes that Congress should develop and pass comprehensive national child day care legislation. Such legislation should be broad-based, involving the needs of middle class children and families as well as children of the poor. Emphasis in any comprehensive legislative package should be on quality as well as affordability. Day care should provide developmental care, not just custodial care.

Care of children away from their own families involves certain hazards. Safeguards should be established and enforced to ensure the well-being of children outside their homes -- whether with otherfamilies, in groups under public or voluntary auspices, in private for profit facilities, or in independent homes. The Child Welfare League of America recommends that comprehensive child day care legislation address the establishment of Federal standards of quality day care. These

standards should be based on an accountability model and enforceable.

Legislation providing for comprehensive child day care should involve a full mosaic of participants -- from center-based case to family day care. Until such time as Federal standards are established and enforced, all participants in programs receiving Federal assistance, should be required to meet applicable state and local licensing and regulatory requirements. Specialized day care for children with special needs should be emphasized, especially for those who are abused, neglected, or handicapped. Day care, especially when coordinated with the provision of social services, can be an important tool for family preservation. It can prevent the need for foster care placements, reduce family stress and abuse, and prevent the breakup of families.

Comprehensive legislation should recognize that availability of day care, as well as affordability, is a problem. In the day care field, demand is exceeding supply. This is, in the main, because the profitability of day care as a private enterprise is negatively affected by the labor intensive nature of the business. The salaries and status of child day care workers are at dismally low levels, yet the average family cannot afford to pay enough each month to make it profitable for private entrepreneurs to hire enough qualified staff. As a result, child-to-staff ratios are below standard and the qualifications

and training of those entrusted with our youngest and most vulnerable children are minimal. Trained and experienced staff can find other jobs which pay moreand turnover is great. Child care centers are even losing out to the fast food chains in the competition for personnel. The pay is better and the work easier. Comprehensive legislation must address the problems of staff turnover and low salaries. Training should be provided not only for child care providers but to administrators as well so that they can better implement licensing and standards requirements and, thus, improve quality.

Any comprehensive day care legislation should likewise address other factors which contribute to a lack of availability. Zoning regulations in many urban and suburban residential areas prohibit the operation of family day care homes. Even Federal regulations are a problem. The Department of Housing and Urban Development, for example, prohibits public housing residents from operating family day care homes in its facilities. Information and referral services (I and Rs) need to be supported to improve parents' ability to find appropriate care. This can be particularly important in maximizing the use of family day care.

Federal legislation should not miss the opportunity to assure that child care is developmental as well as affordable. Studies done by the Cornell Consortium on Developmental Continuity and the High Scope Foundation have already documented the dividend which can be realized from an investment in developmental child day care. Children who attend quality day

care programs are less likely to be held back a grade or put into a remedial class later in school. They are more likely to graduate and less likely to drop out. Less special education is required and future employment prospects are brighter. Taking good care of our children today is the best way to take care of our country tomorrow.

The bottom line, of course, is that quality day care must also be affordable and federal legislation must address this as well. Assistance should be provided on a sliding scale fee basis, assuring help for all young families in need of child care, based on their ability to pay. Such assistance can be provided either directly, by means of certificates, or indirectly, through contracts for center-based care.

All partner's in the provision of child care service should be involved. There is a role for family day care, employer care and center-based care -- as long as they meet standards of quality.

Federal investment will be required. Up front money in considerable amounts is needed but there are dividends to be gained. In the short-term, this investment will strengthen our economy by increasing the productivity of workers with children and by building a true child care industry with professional workers. In the long term, it will contribute to the strength on our next generation. By so doing, we can reduce the need for future federal outlays. Thank you for putting this crucial issue on the Senate's agenda. - 10 -

Senator DODD. I apologize. As I say, the statements will be accepted and they are part of the record and members do go over them, and their staffs as well, to elicit ideas for the legislative proposals.

I apologize for abbreviating the discussion, but I am concerned that we are going to get into the afternoon and we will not get to questions, which are very important to all of us.

Helen Blank, we thank you for being here. Helen, your testimony is in front of us. It is accepted in full. If you want to paraphrase, or however you want to handle it, please proceed.

Ms. BLANK. I will paraphrase. I will be brief. Many of the witnesses have covered a lot of issues.

Senator DODD. I appreciate that.

Ms. BLANK. I just want to say before I speak briefly that we at CDF do appreciate both——

Senator MIKULSKI. Would you talk into the microphone?

Ms. BLANK. Surely.

We at CDF appreciate both of your constant commitment to child care over the last several years. We have taken steps at the federal level. They may have been small, as I will talk about, but what steps we have taken are due to the strong commitment of both of you. It is wonderful to see you both on the same Committee. Hopefully we can take some bigger steps with you working together.

Senator DODD. Thank you, Helen.

Ms. BLANK. I think that it is time to roll up our sleeves—Ed talked about band-aid approaches—and be honest about what we need in child care for our families and our children, to do less is a disservice to our children.

The steps that we have taken as we have recognized that child care is an issue that will now affect the majority of American families have been so small that I do not know if it is fair to call them modest.

At the federal level, if we look at the Title XX Social Services Block Grant, the largest direct source of support for child care, we find that its buying power is 50 percent less today than it was in 1976.

We have passed some federal child care initiatives in the last three years, but they have only begun to address the major systemic problems in our child care system. They have also not provided a single drop of assistance to help those families that Doug talked about buy child care.

At the state level, progress is terribly uneven. For the last 5 years, we have, because the federal government will not anymore, chronicled state day care activities. If you live in Massachusetts or if you live in New York, you see important changes and you see progress. There have been changes in systems and increases the number of children being served.

However, you live in Georgia, you still have 76,000 children needing child care and 8,000 children receiving it. If we look at even some of the positive steps at the state level, they do not make sense for working parents. We now have states looking at pre-school programs for at-risk children. These are important, but they only last 2½ hours a day.

I think it is time that we gave employers the benefit of the doubt. We cannot expect employers to build the child care system in this country. Let us look at health insurance. Many employers still do not provide health insurance. We have 37 million people who are uninsured.

But alongside the health insurance system, we have a Medicaid system that costs billions of dollars. We do not have that in child care. I think we are asking an awful lot of employers. If we look at on-site child care, we see many child care experts saying it is serving employers who serve upper-income families. Employers are not locating these programs in plants. They are locating them in central offices. Doug talked about the small numbers who are participating. They can and must do more, but they are not, and should not be asked to fund the core of our child care system.

The need is startling. We have, in 1984, one-fifth of husbands heading two-parent families and two-thirds of women heading single-parent families who are low-wage earners. Half of Kentucky's counties offer no child care support to low-income working parents. Fewer than 10 percent of the children eligible in California receive support; 20,000 of 300,000 children in Pennsylvania receiving support.

AFSCME recently conducted a recent poll. They surveyed 600 families and nearly 4 out of 10 respondents claimed that they cannot afford the service they use or are precluded from using other more desirable services by cost.

We think child care is more important now than ever, not just because more families need it, but because of other factors that are coming together that should push this very high on the national agenda.

The first is welfare reform. There seems to be no consensus on how to fix welfare, but there is a consensus by all players that you cannot put women to work with young children without child care. We have seen study after study show this. The Massachusetts ET program spends half of its funds on child care. A huge portion of California's GAIN workfare program goes for child care.

At the federal level, we have some minimal child care provisions in the bill that passed the House, and we know that there are child care provisions included in the Senate welfare reform proposals. They will make a difference, but they will not create a decent child care system. They will provide a modest amount of dollars to help mothers on welfare and mothers moving off welfare to pay for child care. But we are seeing welfare reform at least push the link between child care and a woman's ability to be self-sufficient up to the top of policymakers' lists.

We have other witnesses who have talked about pre-school. The National Governors Association, the Council on Economic Development, and business and government leaders are saying that a high-quality early childhood development experience is key to the future of young children. That means good child care.

You talked, Senator Dodd, about how to convince businesses. Businesses are going to have a terrible time recruiting. Young people between the ages of 16 and 24 made up 23 percent of the population in 1978. In 1995, they will only account for 16 percent of the population.

My testimony is replete with statistics concerning basic skills. Many of our young people do not have the basic skills to make it in the job market. Basic skills are intimately connected to the ability to work and to get decent salaries. Child care is the place to start to get children ready to learn those basic skills.

Another factor that we think makes child care an easier issue to sell which is driving the issue is that middle-class parents are saying that the lack of child care is causing stress and affecting their productivity at work. Study after study many of them which are quoted in my testimony that talk about this.

Our challenge is to take all of these issues, to take the needs of our children and families, and to weave it into a pattern of services that makes sense. Almost 70 organizations have come together to form the Alliance for Better Child Care. Two of our members are my fellow panel members.

The goal of ABC is to pass a major new child care initiative which would not only make funds available to help families pay for child care, but also provide States with funds and financial incentives to improve the quality and expand the supply of child care for all families.

It is clear that the states cannot provide child care by themselves. It is also clear that employers cannot do it. Churches cannot do it by themselves. We see more of the American public saying the government must spend more for child care.

Four large polls in the last several years come up with a consensus of respondents saying, indeed, the government should spend more for child care. We know the responsibility must be shared by many partners, but we do not feel that we can address our child care issues in this country unless the federal government becomes a more equal partner.

We also do not think that we can fool ourselves by moving small initiatives and saying we are really helping those millions and millions of children who need child care.

The final details of the ABC proposal are still being hammered out through a consensus procedure. We have worked on this proposal not only with the almost 70 members of ABC, but with child care advocates and policymakers in every State of this country.

We understand there is tremendous resistance to new federal spending, but we believe collectively that we have to meet America's child care needs head-on. We cannot solve the problems that have been discussed all morning unless we spend money. There is no way we can hide the issue.

We have found money for other issues when the need becomes large enough. We, not only as members of ABC, but as groups who represent and work with children across the country, know that we have to find those resources.

We know we have a formidable task ahead, but we are optimistic because we believe that if we wait too much longer, we are threatening the future of our whole economy by not taking care of our children.

Thank you.

[The prepared statement of Ms. Blank follows:]

Children's Defense Fund
122 C Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20001

Telephone (202) 628-8787

TESTIMONY BEFORE THE
SUBCOMMITTEE ON CHILDREN, FAMILY, DRUGS, AND ALCHOHOLISM
OF THE LABOR AND HUMAN RESOURCES COMMITTEE

Helen Blank
Director, Child Care
June 10, 1987

There is a new sense of urgency about child care issues. This sense of urgency is well founded. By 1995, two thirds of all preschool age children or nearly 15 million children will have a mother in the workforce. This will represent a 50 percent increase over the 1985 figure of 9.6 million children. Mothers are working out of economic necessity. A 1983 New York Times poll indicated that "for 71 percent of mothers who work the primary reason was not for something interesting to do but to support their family."

The reawakening of interest in child care is due, to a heightened understanding of the central role that child care plays in America's economic security--present and future. Our challenge is to translate this new attention into public policy which supports our families and prepares our children for rich and productive lives. We cannot afford to shirk away from this challenge.

Progress toward a coherent child care policy over the past 15 years has been fragmented and tentative. The steps that have been taken toward meeting the growing child care needs of America's families have, for the most part, been small, hardly enough to make up for the ground lost in 1981 when Congress and the President reduced the Title XX Social Services Block Grant--the largest source of direct federal child care support--by 20 percent, much less enough to keep pace with inflation and rapidly increasing need. Even before the 1981 cuts, Title XX child care

programs only served 472,000 of the 3.4 million children living in poverty in 1981. In 1984, there were 4.9 million children in that age group and less money to serve them. Since 1981, the steps taken to address child care at the federal level have been too small to be termed even modest: $5 million dollars allocated to provide start-up funds for school-age child care and resource and referral services, $10 million authorized to help children who need child care as a respite service and for those in crisis nursuries, $10 million authorized to help low-income college students pay for the care that they need to complete their education, and $1.5 million to help caregivers seeking to improve their skills and earn a Child Development Associate credential.

At the state level, progress is uneven, depending more on the health of each state's economy than on its child care needs. States with stronger economies (such as Massachusetts and New York) are taking positive steps, while states with weaker economies have not only failed to move forward but, worse yet, have moved backwards. Georgia, which provides child care help to only 8,000 out of 76,000 eligible children, reduced its child care budget by 37 percent last year. They, as all of us who have struggled to build a decent child care system, were faced with painful choices. The state did not reduce the number of children who receive child care help but instead lowered already minimal standards for child care and reduced salaries for child care workers.

Even the states that have taken important steps forward have

failed to create a sensible pattern of services which are easily accessible to parents. One example is state efforts to develop preschool programs for four year olds. While the growth of early childhood development programs for low income children is a very important goal, it must be correlated with families' child care needs. These new programs, however, while ostensibly seeking to meet the needs of working parents, are only open for a limited number of hours, not a full working day.

A piecemeal approach to meeting the ever growing child care needs of America's families will not provide children and families with the support they need. The time has come for a bold and far-reaching approach to child care.

The need is startling: Child care costs are high, averaging approximately $3,000 a year per child. Yet, in 1984, one fifth of husbands heading two parent families and 2/3 of women heading single parent families were low wage earners. They could not earn enough to meet the yearly poverty income level for a family of four, even if they worked 52 weeks a year. These families cannot find adequate help in meeting their child care needs:

- Fewer than 10 percent of the 1.1 million eligible California children who are fourteen or younger can be served at the state's current level of child care funding.
- Louisiana, which will reduce child care expenditures by 20 percent this year, already has 9,000 children on the waiting list for state funded child care.
- In 1986, nearly half of Kentucky's counties gave no state funded child care assistance to children of low-income working parents.
- In 1984, only 20,000 of the 300,000 Pennsylvania

children in need of subsidized care received it.

- In a new national survey of 600 American families cunducted by the American Federation of State, County, and Municipal Employees (AFSCME), nearly four out of ten respondents claimed that they cannot afford the service they use or are precluded from using other, more desirable, services by cost.

The need, however, goes beyond affordability. Too many states have failed to enact and enforce basic health and safety protections for children. For example, North Carolina still allows one caregiver to care for seven infants.

The quality of child care is also threatened by the low salaries paid to child care providers. In 1984, 90 percent of private household child care workers and 58 percent of all other child care workers earned less than poverty-level wages. Despite higher levels of education, child care providers are paid less per hour than animal caretakers, bartenders, or parking lot and amusement park attendants, according to the 1980 census. Low salaries hurt the quality of child care available. Low salaries make it increasingly difficult to attract those caregivers with the training that enables them to care best for young children. The National Day Care Study, commissioned by the U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare in 1976, found that children in child care centers--especially low- income children--make the greatest test score gains when they are with caregivers who have participated in specialized education and training programs. But, child care administrators point out that the wages offered today make such staffing virtually impossible to maintain.

A confluence of circumstances has helped move child care to a priority position on the public policy agenda. These factors contribute to the current climate: the Welfare Reform debate, a reawakening of interest in early childhood development programs, and increasing middle class frustration with the lack of quality child care.

There is a broad consensus that the welfare system is fundamentally flawed and must, for the economic health of the nation as well as for that of poor families, be "fixed." This question--how to fix welfare--has fostered heated debate at the state and federal level. However, there is agreement by all players that child care is a critical part of a strategy to move families from poverty and dependence on welfare to self-sufficiency through education, training, and employment. The welfare reform debate has provided a forum in which to publicize the well documented link between the availability of affordable child care and the ability of low-income parents to work. A broader audience is now aware of studies such as the one conducted by the National Social Science and Law Center in 1986 exploring the barriers to employment faced by single mothers receiving welfare benefits in Washington state. Nearly two-thirds of the respondents cited difficulties with child care arrangements as the primary problem in seeking and keeping a job. Seventy-six percent of those women in the survey who had given up looking for work cited child care difficulties as preventing their search for or attainment of employment. A 1982 Census

Bureau survey found that 45 percent of single parents and 36 percent of low-income parents would work if child care were available at a reasonable cost.

On the other hand, a public investment in child care has been shown to be cost effective. The Colorado Department of Social Services has estimated that providing child care assistance to low-income working families costs only 38 percent of what it would cost to provide these same families with AFDC and Medicaid benefits, were they unemployed.

An understanding of these and similar findings has resulted in the inclusion of significant child care provisions in state welfare reform measures--most notably in the Massachusetts ET program, which commits 50 percent of its total budget to child care for program participants, and in the California GAIN program, which in its first year had a child care budget of six million dollars.

One Louisville, Kentucky mother who has become independent with the help of child care assistance speaks movingly about the rewards:

> "We have a very low income and without child care help, I wouldn't get the training I need to make us a better future and maybe some day help someone else."

Federal welfare reform measures now pending before Congress do include child care policy improvements. However, the child care provisions of welfare reform proposals cannot address the serious gaps in our current child care system. Those of us concerned with child care understand welfare reform as part of a

means to an end. It may result in modest but important policy modifications and funding increases. But, perhaps more significantly, the welfare reform movement has educated policymakers, both public and private, about the role that child care plays in helping lift families out of poverty. It has prepared the ground for more substantial steps toward a decent child care system.

While the welfare reform debate has helped heighten an understanding of the link between the availability of child care and the ability of low-income parents to move from dependency to self suffciency, there is also a broader understanding of the link between high quality child care and preschool programs and our nation's future economic health. High quality preschool or early childhood development programs can provide children, particularly low-income children, with the foundation upon which to build the basic skills that they need to become successful students and eventually productive adults.

Demographic changes, particularly the rapidly declining percentage of young people and children in the population, drive an increased interest in "early investment," which includes high quality preschool programs. Young people between the ages of 16 and 24 made up 23 percent of the population in 1978. By contrast, in 1995, they will account for only 16 percent of the population. As the number of future workers declines, the value of every individual worker to business and industry increases. Yet, our traditional neglect of children, particularly poor

children, imperils their futures and our future as a competitive nation.

- One in four children is poor.
- One in three is non-white, of whom two in five are poor.
- One in five is at risk of becoming a teen parent.
- One in six is in a family in which neither parent has a job.
- One in seven is at risk of dropping out of school.

The need to invest now in young children, to help compensate for past neglect and to help assure a competitive workforce in the future, should and does seem to weigh more heavily on the minds of policymakers. An increasing number of business and government leaders agree that early childhood developement programs play a key role in getting children off to a strong start. For example, the Research and Policy Committee of the business-led Committee for Economic Development firmly supports a public investment in such programs for low-income children and finds that the benefits far outweigh the costs. According to the National Governor's Association in its 1986 report Time for Results: The Governors' 1991 Report on Education, quality early childhood programs "reduce the high school dropout rate, increase the college attendance rate, increase employment, and reduce the welfare and crime rate after high school." In a recent article, Fortune magazine strongly supported including comprehensive early childhood development programs, such as Head Start, as the child care component of any workfare program.

While all American children could benefit from preschool programs, those who are less well off have, by far, the most to gain from such programs though they are far less likely to get

the chance to participate. In fact, they are less than half as likely. In 1985, fewer than 33 percent of four-year-olds and 17 percent of three-year-olds whose families had incomes of less than $10,000 a year were enrolled in preschool programs, according to Sheila Kamerman and Alfred Kahn of the Columbia School of Social Work. In contrast, 67 percent of four-year-olds and 54 percent of three-year-olds whose families have incomes of $35,000 a year or more attend preschool programs. Poor children are not getting an equal opportunity to participate in the early childhood development programs that they so badly need if they are to have an equal opportunity to build successful academic careers.

A positive early childhood development experience helps low-income children begin school on a footing more even with their more advantaged peers, improving their ability to gain the basic skills so necessary to their future success. The level of a young person's reading and math skills has a powerful effect on his or her future employment prospects, according to data from the National Longitudinal Survey of Young Americans, analyzed by Dr. Andrew Sum of Northeastern University. Youths who by age eighteen have the weakest basic skills (in the lowest fifth) are between four and seven times more likely to be jobless and out of school in subsequent years than those with above average basic skills. The average poor teenager who is unemployed has basic skills in the bottom fifth relative to his or her age groups and poor jobless minority teens, on the average, fall in the lowest

tenth of the basic skills distribution for their peers.

Basic skills deficiencies are linked closely to the problems of poverty among children and youths. In large part as a result of the deprivation they experience while growing up, nearly half of all poor youths are concentrated in the bottom fifth of the basic skills rankings of all young Americans. More than three-fourths have below average skills. In their hiring decisions, employers often use a high school diploma as a screening mechanism or proxy for attainment of basic skills. It is not surprising, given the fact that 85 percent of all high school dropouts have below average basic skills, that dropouts are two and a half times more likely to be unemployed than high school graduates. The greater the likelihood that young people with diplomas will find work--and work that pays more--means that they have substantially higher average earnings. Male high school graduates between the ages of eighteen and twenty four with no further education earn three-fifths more than dropouts, while their female peers with diplomas have incomes nearly twice as high as female dropouts in the same age group.

Even for youths without diplomas, however, strong basic skills make a difference. Male dropouts with very good basic skills earn nearly twice as much on average as those with very poor skills. They also out-earn male high school graduates with the lowest skill level by roughly 50 percent. The growing awareness of the importance of basic skills, accompanied by an enhanced understanding of the importance that early childhood

development programs play in making sure that children are ready to learn basic skills when they enter school, is fostering increased public support not just for child care, but also for high quality child care.

A third factor is emerging to make child care a policy priority: an increasing number of middle income families are expressing dissatisfaction with their child care arrangements. A number of recent studies vividly illustrate that dissatisfaction with child care arrangements or lack of child arrangements adversely affects the productivity of America's working parents. The AFSCME poll found that three in ten parents suffer from fear that the child care that they are able to afford is not of high quality. Fully 28 percent of all working parents interviewed with children 12 and under had given up a job or a promotion because of the lack of child care. A recent Census Bureau study reported that one in twenty working parents were absent from work in the month previous to the study because of problems with their child care arrangements. A Fortune magazine study of 400 working mothers and fathers with children under 12 also found that dissatisfaction with child care was the most reliable predictor for absenteeism and unproductive work time.

In some cases, the shortage of child care has greater ramifications than reduced productivity.

> Linda Grant's two small children, Anthony (age three) and Maurice (age four) died in Dade County, Florida, on November 6, 1986, in an accident that could have been averted had the family had access to child care help. Although Ms. Grant worked to support her family, her income was so low that she

could not afford to pay for child care for the two children. Because she qualified for government help, she put her children on Florida's waiting list for child care assistance, a list which then included 22,000 other names.

While she waited for help, Ms. Grant relied on friends and relatives to care for the children. But, some days these arrangements fell through, and the boys were left alone. On one such day, November 6, Maurice and Anthony climbed into the clothes dryer to look at a magazine in a seemingly cozy place, closed the door, and tumbled and burned to death.

After their deaths, the Miami Herald observed that "Anthony and Maurice might be alive today if affordable care had been available." The wait for subsidized day care is eighteen to twenty-four months, because local, state, and federal governments have been unwilling to provide the funds to meet the demand for child care help to low-income families. The Miami News wrote, "There are hundreds, maybe thousands more tragedies waiting to happen in Dade County alone, in every home where young children are left to fend for themselves...They're not latchkey kids, they're lockup kids, locked inside for the day by parents who can't afford day care, can't afford not work and can't get government assistance..." Dade County Juvenile Court Judge William Gladstone said, "People who don't want to fund these programs are child abusers."

The challenge before us at the local, state, and federal level is to weave various concerns about child care issues together to demonstrate that they are complementary, not competing, concerns and to translate the various concerns into a new national policy.

The Children's Defense Fund, in collaboration with over 60 national organizations, has launched a major campaign to foster such a policy. This collaboration, the Alliance for Better Child Care (ABC), now includes 64 members such as the Child Welfare League of America, the Office of Church and Society of the United Church of Christ, the American Academy of Pediatrics, The National ParentTeacher Association, the American Federation of Teachers,

the National Education Association, the Service Employees International Union, the Association of Junior Leagues, and many other religious, women's and children's organizations as well as unions and professional groups. The goal of ABC is to pass a major national child care initiative which would make new funds available to help low and moderate income families meet the cost of child care while, at the same time, providing states with direct funds and financial incentives to improve the quality and expand the supply of child care for all families.

We believe the time for such an initiative is ripe not only for the critical reasons already discussed but also because a growing segment of the American public supports increased public spending for child care. A recent Harris poll found that 73 percent of the respondents would be willing to increase their taxes to pay for child care. ABC news pollsters for the Washington Post found that 57 percent of the responderts felt child care programs should be increased in 1987, as compared to 46 percent in 1986. Finally, 71 percent of the AFSCME respondents said that government should be doing more to supply affordable child care.

The responsibility for the provision of high quality child care services must be shared by many partners. Such a partnership must include all levels of government, the private sector, both nonprofit organizations and employers, and parents. Over the past several years, we have seen many of these players expand their role in the provision of child care.

Some state governments are increasing state dollars committed to child care. Other states have taken similar steps. However, the uneven nature of the states' child care policies makes it clear that they cannot fill in the large gaps in our child care system by themselves.

The private sector has also taken a larger role in child care. Churches are currently the largest source of child care in America. Funding of child care services has become a priority for the United Way of America. For example, the United Way of Delaware funds more child care services in Delaware than the state government does.

Employers, too, are increasing their investment in child care. The percent of employers providing some type of child care assistance to their employees has increased 400 percent in the last four years, but still only 3,000 out of six million employers provide some type of child care assistance to their employees. Child care remains the least frequently offered of all employee benefits. Employers' child care assistance can also be quite limited. It ranges from sponsoring noontime seminars on parenting, helping employees find child care, increasing the supply of family day care programs, to sponsoring onsite child care centers. The majority of employers who offer onsite child care are hospitals who use the service as a recruitment tool for nurses. A recent Fortune magazine article highlighted the limitations of on site child care:

- The problems with on-site day care are not so obvious. Since the centers have limited openings, some employees

> get preferential treatment. Manufactureres tend to build on-site day care at headquarters where their higher-paid employees work; often no child care is available at the factories. Says, Robert Lurie, president of Resources for Child Care Management, a consulting firm: "You find situations where the people using the centers are the well-paid professionals who can afford the fees."

Few employers actually help employees pay for child care. Those that provide assistance in buying child care generally offer help through a salary reduction, an approach that most benefits higher paid employees. Few employers have followed the example of American Express, which uses its resources to help their own employees as well as families living in the community. American Express sponsors community-wide resource and referral programs and family day care recruitment campaigns.

While the roles of state governments and the private sector have increased, the role of the federal government has diminished. The current administration not only refuses to become an equal partner in the provision of child care, it has abdicated its potential leadership role both in helping to make child care affordable and in ensuring minimal health and safety protections for children in care. Title XX, the largest source of direct federal funds available to help states make child care more affordable to low-income families, has been slashed so dramatically over the past six years that its buying power in 1986 was less than 50 percent of what it was in 1975. We will not have a coherent child care policy in this country until the federal government joins state governments, the private sector, and parents in the emerging partnership.

While the final details of the ABC legislation are still being hammered out through a consensus procedure by Alliance members, as well as child care advocates and policymakers across the country there are broad principles which underscore this effort. These include the principle that the federal government has a responsibility to help make child care available and to ensure minimal levels of health and safety protections for children in child care.

In order to meet its child care responsibilities, there is no doubt that the federal government will have to commit substantial new funds. While we understand that there is tremendous resistance to major new federal spending, it is time to face this country's child care needs head on. There is no way that we can help the millions of families who cannot afford child care and improve the quality of that child care without a significant infusion of new resources. We, as a nation, must meet that reality. We realize that we have a formidable task ahead. It will take many voices speaking strongly together to make a national child care policy a reality. We are optmistic because we believe that to put off addressing child care for very much longer threatens not only the future of our young children but of our entire economy.

Senator DODD. Thank you, Helen, very, very much for that testimony.

Wendy Sherman.

Ms. SHERMAN. Good afternoon, Mr. Chairman, Senator Mikulski, I think personally one of Maryland's very best. I am here as Maryland's Special Secretary for Children and Youth and Director of Governor William Donald Schaefer's Office for Children and Youth. We thank you for the opportunity to testify today. Maryland and Governor Schaefer appreciate the effort being made to address the crucial child care needs of America's children and families.

I will paraphrase my testimony. It really summarizes many of the things that you have heard here today.

Maryland is not the poorest State in the nation, nor are we at the bottom of the list for providing child care, and yet you will see from some of the statistics that I will talk about briefly that we cannot do the job. We have many positive initiatives. We have worked on regulations, we have worked on private sector programs, and we are still far from doing the job.

The linkage that Helen and others talked about of the federal government is absolutely crucial. The federal government must increase total dollars available to State for child care. It must help us improve the infrastructure for child care, must help us encourage linkage with business, and recognize that child care and family day care is a business, and increase funding so that child care can be a mandated part of all job training and welfare reform efforts. That cannot happen without increased funding, or we will hurt other parts of those very important efforts.

Maryland has tried very hard. In fact, when Title XX funds were cut in 1981, we put in State general funds to try to help out. Yet, even with the strength that we have, we cannot begin to meet the need.

In 1986, about 68 percent of all children aged 14 and under had mothers in the labor force. That is about 648,000 children. Yet, there were only 73,278 part-time and full-time day care slots available within Maryland's regulated programs.

People have talked about competitiveness today; it is very fashionable. Senator Dodd, you were eloquent in stating how critical early child care is to, in fact, having the economy that we want in the future and a competitive work force.

In fact, our 4-year-olds today, and I have one of them, are really literally and figuratively the social security for our old age. The least we can do is secure their start in life.

I have listed in the testimony, and will not go through them, many of the things that Maryland has done. We do register and license homes. We do provide subsidies, though only for 7,945 slots. We do have a wonderful information and referral service which has allowed us to have the kind of data that I can provide in this testimony, and LOCATE in Maryland was the model for Senator Mikulski's legislation.

Our Department of Economic and Community Development has started a day care loan guarantee program and we are looking at a low-interest loan program and enhanced technical assistance to employers. We have additional incentives for business.

Maryland State government has taken a look and has very supportive family leave policies for its own employees, and is looking at its own responsibility in terms of child care. Maryland also is working hard at looking at pre-kindergarten and pre-school and considering pre-kindergarten as a hub, but we are very cognizant of the important issues of child care and making sure that we do not set up problems by having 2½ hours of care and no extended care for those children.

Maryland clearly cares a lot about child care, but the gaps are still enormous. We all keep saying study and study but it is so apparent, it is amazing it does not sink in for people.

We know that particularly for an economically-disadvantaged 4-year-old, but probably for many 4-year-olds, good pre-kindergarten is important. Yet, in Maryland we only currently serve in our extended elementary education program 2,331 4-year-olds.

We know that welfare and job training efforts are successful when parents have access to affordable day care. Yet, in Maryland in one job training program, as many as 50 percent of the participants failed to complete the program or get a job and had problems related to child care. We know that if we require mother's with children below age 6 to enter work training programs that we are talking about a significantly larger child care problem.

Study after study has shown that quality child care can help families under stress to prevent child abuse and can even help keep families intact in situations of abuse. Yet, in Maryland, as elsewhere, where child abuse has increased 121 percent from 1978 to 1984, and child sexual abuse 367 percent, the number of subsidized slots rose only 46 percent in that same time period.

We also have virtually no child care for handicapped children, and I could talk at length about that and I will be glad to answer questions about it.

Study after study has shown that child care is critical to job retention. Yet, our own private sector initiatives task force found that business often does not know where to start. It is not that they do not want to get started; they are not quite sure what to do.

Study after study has shown that a trained professional staff is essential to quality child care. Yet, in Maryland the average center teacher's salary in 1985 was $7,000 and the average family provider, $8,000.

Finally, study after study has shown that one of the most severe needs for families is infant care, given the dramatic increase in mothers in the labor force and the need for infants to get a fair start in life. Parental leave policies, even if liberal, only go to 6 weeks.

Yet, in Maryland, in 1980, with approximately 13,160 infants under age one with mothers in the labor force, there were only 1,745 family day care providers to provide care to children under one, and only 200 center-based slots in the entire State of Maryland.

Parents in Maryland currently cover 92 percent of all child care costs, and we are looking at a child care system that is way underfunded with people earning poverty-level wages.

The average in 1986 for that checkbook was $49.62 a week, or $2,580 a year. That compares, just to give you some earmark—our per-pupil education expenditure is about $3,673 a year.

Parents say how can we possibly pay any more? Myself, in a two wage-earner family with fairly good wages, very good wages—we often ask how we can pay more. Yet, society must ask how can we not do more.

We have listed here the four recommendations that we have; as I mentioned earlier, increasing the appropriation for Title XX and absolutely taking a very good and strong and powerful look at what ABC is putting together; recommitting ourselves to Head Start and blending together all the bits and pieces that we have; improving the infrastructure for child care—I think that your legislation, Senator Dodd, around training grants and improving incentives is very important—encouraging business initiatives and day care as a business initiative and adding funds so that job training and child welfare mandate child care only with additional funds.

The federal government has put a lot of money, and wisely so, in charting a course for the stars, launching, even with all its problems, a spaceship well into the next century in a space program.

A spaceship knows no sense of time in its development. A child, however, as one of our wonderful groups has said, cannot wait. We have to launch our children well or there will be no adult to run the spaceship in the 21st century. They will not have the skills to do it and there will be no social security for our old age.

Governor Schaefer, like Senator Mikulski, is well known as a person of action. He knows we must attend to our children, and if he were sitting here today, he would say, as he does to all of us every day, that we must do it and we must do it right now.

Thank you.

[The prepared statement of Ms. Sherman follows:]

STATE OF MARYLAND
EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT

WILLIAM DONALD SCHAEFER
GOVERNOR

OFFICE FOR CHILDREN AND YOUTH

301 WEST PRESTON STREET, SUITE 1502
BALTIMORE, MARYLAND 21201
(301) 225-4290
TDD (301) 333-3098

WENDY R. SHERMAN, SPECIAL SECRETARY

TESTIMONY OF WENDY R. SHERMAN

SPECIAL SECRETARY FOR CHILDREN AND YOUTH

BEFORE THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON CHILDREN, FAMILY, DRUGS AND ALCOHOLISM

SENATOR CHRISTOPHER J. DODD, CHAIRMAN

June 11, 1987

Mr. Chairman, Members of the Subcommittee and Senator Barbara Mikulski, I am Wendy R. Sherman, Maryland Special Secretary for Children and Youth and Director of Governor William Donald Schaefer's Office for Children and Youth.

Thank you for the opportunity to testify today. Maryland and Governor Schaefer appreciate the effort being made to address the crucial child care needs of America's children and families.

Even with Maryland's many positive initiatives, as this testimony will outline, the Federal leadership needed to meet critical child care needs must be much stronger.

The Federal government must:

- o Increase total dollars available to states for child care,
- o Improve the infrastructure for child care,
- o Encourage linkage with business and recognize that child care is a business, and
- o Increase funding so that child care can be a mandated part of all job training and welfare reform efforts.

Maryland is one case example of one state's efforts to meet the rising need of child care. Maryland has a number of positive initiatives to meet child care needs. Maryland is neither the poorest state in the nation, nor is Maryland at the bottom of the list for providing child care. In fact, when federal cuts were made in 1981, Maryland put forth state general funds to try to ensure that we would not lose ground.

Yet, even with the strengths that we have, Maryland cannot begin to meet the need. In 1986, about 68% of all children age 14 and under had mothers in the labor force (648,096 children); 233,877 children age five (5) and under had working mothers. Yet there are only 73,278 part time and full time day care "slots" available within Maryland's regulated programs. *

The impact of these numbers is more profound than even the very real immediate needs of working parents. In an era in which we all talk about investing in the future and of having a competitive work force in the year 2000 we must remember that the four year old today will be the worker of the next century. If we do not support that child's family today; if we don't invest in that four year old's future; if we don't ensure positive growing and learning opportunities for that 4 year old - then our own future truly is at stake. Children today are literally and figuratively the social security for our old age. The least we can do is secure their start in life.

Maryland's Initiatives

Maryland has taken many important steps to providing quality child care which is affordable and accessible:

o Regulation

Maryland has regulated care; licensed group centers and registered family day care providers. There are a variety of options including family, center based, nursery schools, Head Start, before and after school care and pre-school programs. In the last ten years center based care has increased from 576 in 1976 to 1,348 in 1986. We have also created the Interagency Child Care Council to better coordinate what is sometimes a maze of regulation.

o Subsidies

Maryland subsidizes care through federal and state funds providing for 7,945 slots FY 1987 with priority going first to protective services (approximately 25%) and then to the working poor.

o Information and Referral

Working with the private non-profit sector to help parents find child care, we have helped to fund the Maryland Committee for Children's LOCATE statewide information and referral service. Since 1983, LOCATE has handled 17,168 parent inquiries for information and referral services. LOCATE was and is the model for Senator Barbara A. Mikulski's (D.-Md) legislation for national support for such services.

---

* Special thanks to the Maryland Committee for Children whose LOCATE data bank and whose 1987 publication Children, Families and Child Care in Maryland provided many of the statistics in this testimony.

o Day Care as Business

Maryland also works with people who want to become child care providers. The Maryland Department of Economic and Community Development in 1984 began a Day Care Facilities Loan Fund. Used to guarantee up to 80% of a loan, we have to date made 14 guarantees, creating 1,227 new day care enrollments and 198 new employees. We are now considering a low interest loan fund and an enhanced technical assistance capacity to employers and potential providers.

o Additional Incentives for Business

- 1987 Legislation enables local jurisdictions to give a property tax credit to both center and family providers.

- 1986 insurance reform required carriers who already provided automobile and homeowners coverage to a household to add a rider to cover family day care providers.

o School Age Child Care

1987 Legislation mandates local jurisdictions to do assessments of school age child care needs. Given that there are currently only 4,050 spaces for school age children, planning for this need is crucial.

o State Government

1986 Legislation mandates State government to survey new state facilities where there are 700 or more employees and to meet child care needs through onsite or near site if 29 or more employees state a need.

In addition, Maryland state government has a plethora of family supportive leave policies including, for example, a seasonal leave policy. A 12 week leave without pay but with absolute reinstatement rights to former classification, the primary intent is to allow a parent of a school age child to be absent during summer months.

And just recently, Governor Schaefer in a policy directive to all state agencies has directed the immediate implementation of flextime.

o Pre-kindergarten

Through state funds, Maryland operates the EEEP (Extended Elementary Education Program) to begin to provide pre-kindergarten in areas where children are identified highly at risk for school failure.

America's Challenge

Maryland clearly cares about child care but even with all of these initiatives the gaps are enormous.

As you have heard the experts say today, study after study has shown that 4 year olds, particularly economically disadvantaged 4 year olds have a greater chance of success if they have been in a good pre-kindergarten program. *Yet in Maryland in 1986 only 2,331 4 year olds were served by the Extended Elementary Education Program.*

Study after study has shown that welfare reform and job training efforts are most successful in the long term when parents have access to affordable child care. *Yet in one Maryland job training program, as many as 50% of the participants who failed to complete the program or get a job had problems related to child care.* It is important to remember that in the current WIN program only mothers with children 6 and above are required to be in the program. Federal proposals to lower the age of children to 3 or below will make the child care dilemma even greater.

Study after study has shown that quality child care can help families under stress to prevent child abuse and can even help keep families intact in situations of abuse. *Yet, in Maryland, where child abuse has increaaed 121% and child sexual abuse 367% from 1978-1984, the number of subsidized slots rose only 46% in that same time period.*

There is also a profound lack of child care in any form, for infants and children who are handicapped. Some of these children will end up in state care because their parents have not had enough support to enable them to stay at home.

Study after study has shown that a workforce will be retained and will be more productive if quality child care is in place. *Yet in Maryland, the Private Initiatives Task Force, found that business, although aware of, and concerned about child care, often did not know where to begin.*

Study after study has shown that a trained, professional staff is essential for quality care. *Yet in Maryland the average center teacher salary in 1985 was $7,614 and the average family provider was $8,049.*

And, finally study after study has shown that one of the most severe needs for families is infant care given the dramatic increase in mothers in the labor force and the need for infants to get a fair start in life. *Yet in Maryland in 1980 approximately 13,160 infants under age 1 had mothers in the labor force and in 1986 there were only 1,745 family day care providers willing to provide care for children under 1 and only 200 center-based slots statewide.*

Clearly, we in Maryland with all of the strengths and initiatives we have, have a very real problem. Somehow we must generate more resources - which are affordable and provide quality care.

Parents, who in Maryland carry 92% of all child care costs, look at their checkbooks and say how can we possibly pay more. The average in 1986 for center based care was $49.62/week or $2,580/year. (This compares to a statewide 1984-85 per pupil education expenditure of $3,673/year.)

Yet society must ask how can we not do more. To do more however takes a partnership with all levels of government, business, the community and parents.

The Federal Link

The Federal link in this partnership needs some Maryland "steel" to strengthen its role. We would make the following strong recommendations:

(1) Increase the appropriation for Title XX. No matter how we look at child care we need more resources and that means more money. Likewise we must recommit ourselves to Head Start and blend together and add to the bits and pieces of federal programs.

(2) Improve the infrastructure for child care by creating training grants, incentives to educational institutions to develop early childhood personnel, broadening information and referral efforts, and incentives for state regulation of care.

(3) Encourage business initiatives both in terms of employer assisted child care options and assistance to people who want to enter the child care business. The federal government can continue to create incentives - tax credits, salary reduction plans, low interest loan funds, etc. - and provide leadership by looking for every opportunity to help business meet employee child care needs and to help create more child care businesses.

(4) If additional funds can be added, child care should be a mandated part of any job training or welfare reform effort.

The Federal government has wisely charted a course for the stars, launching - even with all its problems - a space program well into the next century. A space ship knows no sense of time in its development. A child, however, can't wait. We must launch our children well or there will be no adult who can run the space stations of the 21st century. And there will be no social security for our old age. Governor Schaefer is well known as a man of action. He knows we must attend to our children and if he were sitting here he would say to you what he says to all of Maryland - we must do it, and we must do it now.

Senator DODD. Wendy, thank you very, very much.

Let me say in advance to all four of you that we will submit some written questions to you as well, to cover whatever we do not complete in our discussion here in the early part of this afternoon.

Let me begin with you, Helen, if I can. You are upbeat and positive, and God bless you. I try to stay the same. In fact, when I leave here I am going to address a business panel on parental leave. I always seek out those groups. I would rather talk to them, with all due respect, than the Children's Defense Fund because I am, in a sense, preaching to the choir. But it does get frustrating, I have to tell you, reaching out there to the business community.

How much time do you think it is going to take before we can get an infrastructure built in this country that can do what you have suggested?

Ms. BLANK. It depends on how much time it will take Congress to put this issue on the table. You know, you found time when Lenny Bias died. I always talk about those two children from Florida whenever I speak. Unfortunately, they do not have the same impact as an all-star basketball player.

We are hoping that if we pull the Alliance for Better Child Care together—and other groups who are about the importance—such as employers who support ABC's initiative as well as some stars who are for better child care that Congress will be convinced to find the resources to address this issue. I realize that the situation is tight, but we think it can be done.

Senator DODD. Too often, I think we very conveniently separate the social agenda of the country from the defense agenda. We say there are the advocates for the social agenda and then there are other advocates for the national security agenda.

What happens is you find these two groups competing for what obviously is a shrinking pie. But we need to start thinking about some of these social issues as being part of the seamless garment of the national security of the country. I have some wonderful photographs, that we found at the Library of Congress which were taken in New Britain, CT between 1941 and 1945 of some of the most successful child care programs in the country.

These programs were started very simply because the young men were in the Pacific and the European theaters fighting, the women were working in the defense production effort of this country and the children had to be cared for.

So we set up a very elaborate and very successful system. In fact, the child care facility Mr. Goldberg talked about in Santa Monica, a federally funded program, is one of the few that remains from the World War II era.

It was established to provide child care facilities for women who were building planes, submarines, battleships, and jet engines. And we provided them with very effective, very efficient, low-cost, subsidized child care.

So, there, the national security of the country was on the line and no one had any questions about the wisdom of the program then. Today, in a sense, we are confronted with a very similar type of situation.

So I like to get away from that debate which says if you can build a B–1, you can do this. That is too easy. We are going to build

the security systems to defend this country. We are not going to stop doing that. But if we can get people to think about child care as being part of our security system, we have a better chance politically of being successful. So I thank you for your comment on that.

Doug Baird, I have listened to more testimony about the ET program. I thought I was coming to watch a trailer for a movie when I first heard about it. But how does child care fit into all of that? What are its strengths and weaknesses as you have seen it develop in Massachusetts?

Mr. BAIRD. You cannot do ET without child care. In Massachusetts in the last 3 years, we have moved 30,000 people from the welfare rolls into full-time employment. We have done it by providing continuity of their health care benefits and providing good and continuous child care.

Despite the fact that the federal regulations do not allow us to do that with federal money, we use State money to make sure that we provide continuous child care. Simply put, it works. It is working. We are having much lower rates of return to the welfare rolls than comparable States.

I think the other thing that I would want to say here is that ET is entirely voluntary. There is no workfare in Massachusetts. We tried workfare during a previous administration and it was just plain not successful. ET does work; it works because it is voluntary.

Senator DODD. You also talked about minimum federal standards. Well, you talked about federal standards; you did not say "minimum." I am using the word "minimum." Are we not seeing a certain consensus develop around the country as states are developing standards?

If there is that consensus out there and it is working at the state level, is it really necessary for the federal government to jump in with a set of standards?

Mr. BAIRD. Senator, I wish they were all the same. Let me give you just one simple example. In Massachusetts when one provides care to a child under the age of 18 months, you can have a caregiver-to-child ratio of 1-to-3.

The worst caregiver-to-child ratio in the United States currently is 1-to-7. There are States that allow seven infants to be under the care of one person. Now, again, I go back to your comments on World War II.

You can go back to research done during the 1950s about children in institutions who had been left in institutions and orphanages. There is a whole term of art; it is called anomie. It is a disease that results in the child never developing any sense of drive or willingness to grow.

Anomie comes when there is a lack of stimulation and a lack of support and a lack of enthusiastic relationship between a child and an adult when a child is very young. So the matter of standards is crucial.

If all the States were to, of their own volition, choose to move to a 1-to-3 or a 1-to-4 ratio with infants, then perhaps there would be no need for federal standards.

Senator DODD. Mr. Fege, you are a member of the PTA. A lot of the members of the PTA are members of the business community. How successful are you with members of the business community—

who are also members of the PTA—in getting them to be supportive of child care?

Mr. FEGE. Well, I am not so sure I understand the question, but I will try to address it in a number of ways and if it does not focus on your question, please ask it again.

Number one, I think that the members of the business community in the PTA are our backbone, and I am not talking about the CEO's from IBM or Continental Can. It is the moderate to low-income people, business people who are the backbone of our membership. We do not have a lot of CEOs in our membership and we do not have the president of the Chamber of Commerce in our membership. They have alternatives for child care.

On the basis of anecdotes and the parents who have contacted our offices, we get more and more calls from parents from the business sector suggesting to us that they have no affordable child care or that, they have no child care available at all.

One of the things we have not discussed this morning is the rural parts of our country. I would ask, if I might, that this article from the Des Moines Register be placed in the record: "Working Couples to be Stuck for 96 percent of a Tax Increase in Iowa" at a time when they are already facing economic difficulty. In fact, Iowa has had more bank foreclosures this year than they have at any time during the Depression, and business feels that. I think they understand that child care services are instrumental to their success.

Business has a lot to gain. Productivity will go up, absenteeism will go down. I think families will feel, certainly, less stressed.

You would ask is there any more money forthcoming. First of all, I think we have to tell the defense establishment, instead of the Russians are coming, the Russians are coming, the Russians are educating, the Russians are caring, and the star pupils and star students are more important than Star Wars.

I am not concerned about arguing the defense versus domestic programs issue, but DOD had better understand that the future of the external defense of this country depends on the kinds of skills and care, early intervention, that we provide youngsters today. We are educating youngsters for the 21st century. The youngsters entering school today will graduate in the year 2000.

The other issue is, I think, and I quote you, Mr. Chairman, is that as well as supporting childcare and other early intervention programs, we are spending less of our gross national product on children than we did 15 years ago. I quote that everywhere I go, Senator.

And I also have treatises such as this, "Investing in Our Children." This is written CED, Committee for Economic Development. The Chamber of Commerce has put out reports. My concern is at the local level, what is happening out there, and I agree with the other panel members that the federal government is not providing leadership in this area, incentives, getting business together, creating a consensus and funding effective programs. I am not very optimistic that business will follow without that kind of leadership.

Senator DODD. That feeds right into a question I have for you, Wendy, and that is the tax incentive idea. We have tried the tax

incentive idea in Connecticut and it has not been taken advantage of.

Ms. SHERMAN. Well, I think we have to look at why they were not taken advantage of. Was it that business really did not know how to proceed? Was it not a priority for business? Did they not see it as an issue?

For parents, in terms of our tax incentives, we certainly take use of it. Salary reduction plans—I think we just need to look at the financial tools that are available both for business and for individuals that may produce those kinds of incentives, as well as cafeteria-style benefits, vouchers.

We have a few businesses in Maryland that do contracts with a child care center. They pay part of the cost and there is a payroll deduction for the rest of the cost. So you sort of begin to feel it as part of what you do, just like you deal with your health care and your social security pension.

It is a part of the family supports that we need to go forward, and I think we just have to look at all of the different tools that we might have to be able to move this agenda forward.

As Dr. Zigler said, it is a puzzle and it is a patchwork and it is not like there is going to be a single hit that will take care of it.

Ms. BLANK. Can I just talk about tax incentives for one second?

Senator DODD. Certainly.

Ms. BLANK. We have seen, too, that the Connecticut ones do not work. At the federal level, we have a tax incentive on the books. It helps mostly middle and upper-income families through salary reduction. An employer does not have to pay social security or unemployment tax, and employees, before the Tax Reform Act, significantly reduced their tax liability, especially if they were in a high tax bracket.

I think it is also important to consider tax incentives as drains on the federal or State treasury. The government has spent probably now close to $3 billion on the dependent care tax credit and the costs of salary reduction are growing. We do have a significant amount of tax money that is targeted out for child care.

While we do not look at it as a direct expense, it is an expense to the government. Should not employers do this on their own as an addition, above the line, and should we not spend government money for the other issues that they will not address?

Most people work for small employers who will not be moved by tax incentives, but I think we need to rethink tax incentives in terms of lost government resources and the private sector commitment. Should it not be above the line? I think that is something to look at more carefully.

Senator DODD. Let me lastly say, Mr. Baird, Senator Cranston has offered legislation, which I am a cosponsor of, to set incentives for States to establish minimum standards. I will send you some questions on that as well and I would like you to respond to them in writing.

I am going to turn to Senator Mikulski and then we will——

Senator MIKULSKI. Wrap up.

Senator DODD. Wrap up.

Senator MIKULSKI. Ms. Sherman and I have a meeting we have to get to, so we are looking forward to wrapping up. But speaking

of wrapping up, I would like to ask Helen Blank when ABC is going to complete their consensual process and come in with their recommendations.

Ms. BLANK. You know, we started this last July.

Senator MIKULSKI. I know you did. That is why I want to know when you are going to——

Ms. BLANK. We are almost finished. The steering committee organizations are looking——

Senator MIKULSKI. I do not need to hear the process. I just need to know when——

Ms. BLANK. The bill should be ready by August.

Senator MIKULSKI. By August?

Ms. BLANK. By August, by the end of July, yes.

Senator MIKULSKI. Ms. Sherman, you have talked in your testimony about these public-private initiatives that need to occur in order to work. I happen to believe, like you do, it is not going to work unless there are these private sector involvements.

You heard the questions that Senator Dodd had. Do you have any other thoughts on how the private sector can be involved? Do you think there has to be a national conference? Do you think we need to go to Wall Street or the Fortune 500?

Ms. SHERMAN. I think any action where there is leadership to raise the visibility of this issue and to help the business community find the way to answers they want to find—it is not a bunch of bad guys sitting around saying we do not want to deal with our child care needs or with the child care needs of our employees. They do understand some of the issues.

I think that that kind of visibility, holding conferences, holding roundtables—what Fortune Magazine did probably moved the agenda many steps ahead. I think that there are also brokerage roles that State governments certainly can play, and that is we have businesses who come to us and we need to see it as a part of our economic development as well as very critically our human resources and our welfare mission to have businesses who come to the State and say I want to move to the State of Maryland, I want to increase my business, I want to keep my business here. Child care is one of those pieces for employee retention. What do I do?

We have on the other side through our day care loan guarantee program people who come wanting to become providers, needing business technical assistance about how to get started as a small business.

We can play a brokerage role to say to the business over here we have some providers over here, they meet your market needs, and introduce them to each other because as many people have pointed out, on-site child care for an employer only works under a certain set of circumstances.

We also have one of our county executives who has now said to industrial parks that are building that we want a child care center in the middle of the industrial park, and just recently three have agreed to do so.

I think it is that kind of effort which can be brought about by federal leadership, but has to happen at the State and local level, that will move that agenda as well.

Senator DODD. Anything else?

Senator MIKULSKI. No.

Senator DODD. Well, I thank all four of you. We will send out some written questions to you. You have been very patient to stay with us all morning and into the afternoon.

I mentioned a while ago we will be holding hearings on parental leave in Boston. We are taking those hearings on the road. We will be in Boston, Los Angeles, Chicago, and Atlanta. And we are going to try, in the next several months, to put together a more comprehensive bill here to deal with the child care issue itself. So I thank all of you for coming.

This subcommittee will stand adjourned until the call of the Chair.

[Whereupon, at 1:13 p.m., the subcommittee was adjourned.]

81-972 (160)